



Lawrence E. Fisher

The Cole Lectures for 1916
delivered before Vanderbilt University

The Foundation of Modern Religion

A Study in the Task and Contribution of the Mediæval Church

By
HERBERT B. WORKMAN, D. D., LL. D.
Senator London University, President of Westminster Training College, London

NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, 1916, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY



New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 17 North Wabash Ave.
Toronto: 25 Richmond Street, W.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 100 Princes Street

THE COLE LECTURES

THE late Colonel E. W. Cole of Nashville, Tennessee, donated to Vanderbilt University the sum of five thousand dollars, afterwards increased by Mrs. E. W. Cole to ten thousand, the design and conditions of which gift are stated as follows:

"The object of this fund is to establish a foundation for a perpetual Lectureship in connection with the Biblical Department of the University, to be restricted in its scope to a defense and advocacy of the Christian religion. The lectures shall be delivered at such intervals, from time to time, as shall be deemed best by the Board of Trust; and the particular theme and lecturer shall be determined by nomination of the Theological Faculty and confirmation of the College of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Said lecture shall always be reduced to writing in full, and the manuscript of the same shall be the property of the University, to be published or otherwise disposed of by the Board of Trust at its discretion, the net proceeds arising therefrom to be added to the foundation fund, or otherwise used for the benefit of the Biblical Department."

Contents

I. The Church and Its Task in the Middle Ages 11

II. The Dawning of the Missionary Consciousness of the Church . . 55

III. The Ideals and Antagonistic Forces of the Middle Ages . . . 101

IV. The Dawning of the Modern Social Consciousness 141

V. The Monks and Their Work . . 183

VI. Mediæval Educational Ideals and Methods 213

LECTURE I

THE CHURCH AND ITS TASK IN THE MIDDLE AGES

LECTURE I

THE CHURCH AND ITS TASK IN THE MIDDLE AGES

I

WITH the fall of the Roman Empire in its western section we enter upon a new chapter in the history of humanity. The former things had passed away; but it was rather the coming of a new hell than of a new earth or a new heaven that seemed, at first, to be the result. An optimistic faith may assert that it was necessary to remove the things that were shaken, even though the removal should be by consuming fires, that there might be laid the abiding foundations of a new City of God. As in a ruder age the foundations were laid in blood, but the nature of the superstructure is not so clear. One thing, however, is certain, that but for the Church, foundations and city alike would have been of the devil.

The student would do well to obtain some idea of the task which awaited the Church in the six centuries between the sack of Rome and the conclusion of the wanderings of the nations. He should turn to the map of the Empire and realize its meaning; the majesty of its unity, the diversity of nations and of tongues which had lost their differences in the proud consciousness of a common citizenship, the reality of the law and order which bound the ends of the earth

to one common centre, the peace which was Rome's greatest gift to a suffering world, the extent and depth of her civilization, the wide diffusion of the arts, culture, philosophy, and science of the old world. The darker sides of the picture he would do well, for the moment, to neglect; the dark superstitions, the religious rottenness, the financial ruin, especially of the middle classes, the limited few for whom the culture and civilization existed, the vast hordes of slaves, the social and political cancers which had eaten out the heart of the Empire. These things should be abstracted; the majesty of Rome and her civilization is so incontestably great that a world in which that force was lost, or even in danger of being lost, seemed to Christian and heathen alike a ruined world. From his realization of the greatness of the Empire, and of the debt under which she had laid humanity, let the reader now turn to the results of the wanderings of the nations. In place of the old unity of speech, religion, law, and civilization, we find a babel of languages, a chaos of conflicting barbarisms, anarchy written large on all life, literature dead, art unknown, a darkness that might be felt covering the face of the deep.

A brief survey of the extent of the ruin is necessary if my hearers would apprehend the greatness of the Church's task. The invasion of Greece by the West Goths under Alaric (396) began the series of movements which resulted in the breaking up of the Western Empire. Driven from their original home round the Aral by the pressure of the Huns, the West Goths swept through Thrace, Greece, and Illyricum, and under Alaric captured Rome itself

(408). The death of Alaric terminated for a while their onward march; but this deadly blow at the heart of the Empire had already been accompanied by the loss of outlying provinces. In 407 the Romans retired from Britain; fifty years later such civilization as there they had established was swept away before the inroads of Saxons, Angles and Jutes. In 409 a mixed band of Vandals, Suevians and Alans —the last a race, probably, of non-Aryan origin— crossed the Rhine, ravaged Gaul, and occupied Spain, though many of the towns still remained in Roman hands. In 413 the West Goths, retiring from Italy, advanced to the Pyrenees, and established in Northeast Spain a kingdom with Barcelona as the capital; in Southern Gaul a second kingdom round Toulouse. From these centres they slowly extended their dominion over almost the whole of the peninsula. In consequence of their pressure, the Vandals in 429 abandoned Spain and invaded Africa. Under the leadership of Gaiseric their conquest was rapid; the loss of Carthage in 439 marked the beginning of the end of Roman dominion. Thirty years later Sardinia, Corsica and the Balearic Islands surrendered to the Vandal fleets.

Northern Gaul had already fallen before the Salian Franks. This German tribe, from the regions between the Scheldt and Rhine, throughout the fifth century slowly consolidated their conquests, until in 507 Chlodovech (Clovis) drove back the West Goths beyond the Garonne. Meanwhile in Southeast Gaul another Teutonic tribe, the Burgundians, established themselves in Savoy (439); while in Italy the great Theodoric founded an Ostrogothic kingdom which

stretched from Pannonia (Hungary) to Sicily (489–493).

Even more dreaded in their ravages than Vandals, Ostrogoths, or Franks were the Huns, Asiatic nomads akin to the Turks, who in the fifth century established under Attila an empire which reached from the Volga to the Rhine, from the Danube to the Baltic. Their defeat at Mery-sur-Seine in 451 alone saved Gaul from their devastations; while their invasion of Italy, in 452, is said to have led to the foundation of Venice by the Christian fugitives, who, after the sack of the great city of Aquileia, took refuge in the islands of the lagoons.

In the sixth century, a temporary revival of the Empire under Justinian (576) led to the disappearance of the kingdoms of the Vandals and Ostrogoths; but other races were ready to take their place. In 565 the Lombards, whose original home was probably near the Weser, descended into Italy from Pannonia, and within four years won for themselves the country which still bears their name.

The first irruptions of barbarians had broken upon the Roman Empire only to be assimilated by its higher civilization. Many of them were already Arian Christians; others were speedily converted. Not so with the hordes that in later years swept across the continent already exhausted by earlier struggles, and whose powers of assimilation had vanished through satiety. In the East, Slavonic tribes, Chrobats, Serbs, Sorbs and others, were slowly occupying what had once been imperial soil, bringing with them political problems that have dyed the soil of Europe with blood; while in Northern Europe,

Slovenes. Wends, and Czechs were establishing themselves in their permanent homes, attempting to hem in Teutonic expansion on the East. As if this medley of Teutonic and Slavonic races were not sufficient, we find in the seventh century non-Aryan races of Turanians swarming over parts of Europe. In 679 the Bulgarians crossed the Danube and occupied their present kingdom. Another oriental tribe, the Ugrian Magyars, a race very different in origin from the Huns, with whom they are so often confused, were for many years the terror of Europe. But in 955, after their great defeat at Lechfeld by Otto the Great, they settled down in Pannonia, a district afterwards known, through this mistake in identification, as Ungaria or Hungary.

The Turanian invaders, Magyars and Bulgarians, did not long resist the influences of Christianity. A more serious blow to the Church, the effects of which are still felt in every continent of the Old World, came from the Semitic East. When Gregory the Great died (604) Muhammad (b. 570) had not yet begun to believe in his own mission. Serious as was the outlook for the Faith in the West at the dawn of the seventh century in its struggle with the barbarians, consolation might still have been found in the vitality, apparent alas! rather than real, of the churches in Egypt, Syria, Northern Africa and the Mediterranean basin in general. Even Spain, which under her Visigothic conquerors had embraced Arianism, in the year 589 had renounced her heresy at the council of Toledo and proclaimed her return to the Roman unity. As so often happens it was in the districts of seeming strength that disaster came.

Regions in which for centuries the Gospel had been supreme were lost to the Cross, and the original centres of Christianity were swallowed up in the vortex of Islam. There is no evidence that Muhammad contemplated the extension of his creed beyond the confines of Arabia. Immediately after the death of the prophet, Islam had to fight for its very existence; yet such was the spell it cast over its reluctant converts that before a century was completed, Syria, North Africa, Egypt, the most fertile districts of Spain, exchanged their Christianity for the creed of their Muslim masters.

Christianity was assailed along its whole frontier, and in the East the ruin was complete. Christian indifference and discord were no match for the new fanaticism. "The sword," cried Muhammad, "is the key of heaven and of hell; a drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting or prayer; whosoever falls in battle his sins are forgiven, at the last day his wounds shall be resplendent as vermilion and odoriferous as musk." "Remember," said the Caliph, Abu Bekr, to his Syrian army, "that you are always in the presence of God, on the verge of death, in the assurance of judgment, and the hope of Paradise. When therefore you fight the battles of the Lord, quit you like men." At the siege of Damascus, Khalid, the "Sword of God," was urged to rest. "O Derar," he replied, as he mounted a fresh horse, "we shall rest in the world to come; he that labours to-day shall rest to-morrow." When Muhammad proclaimed war on the Emperor Heraclius, some of the more timid, who had not yet discerned

so clearly as their leader the splendid weakness of the Romans, pleaded the intolerable heat: "Hell is much hotter," cried the indignant Prophet, as he excommunicated the cowards. "Paradise is before you, the Devil and hell fire in your rear," echoed his generals at the fatal battle of the Yermuk (634).

Such promises and threats cried havoc and let slip the dogs of war. Religion became an intrepid fanaticism; a heaven of black-eyed houris, the reward of carnage. Before his death Muhammad had seen the conquest of Arabia; under his immediate successors Arabia threatened to overwhelm the world. In the ten years of the reign of Omar, the Saracens conquered thirty-six thousand cities and castles, and destroyed four thousand churches. "The Arabs dwell," sings one of their poets, "beneath the shadow of their lances; they cook their food upon the ashes of conquered towns." Within a few years their zeal had crushed Persia (633–642) and overthrown the religion of Zoroaster. In the North, Khalid swept all before him, captured Damascus, Jerusalem, and Antioch, and drove back Heraclius and his veterans in flight to Constantinople (636?). In the West, Amr (Amrou), by the help of the Coptic Christians, overran Egypt, turned Memphis, the city of ancient Pharaohs, into a solitude, and captured Alexandria, the first city in the world for trade, the second in population.

The ambition or selfishness of Rome might possibly view with indifference the fall of the three ancient patriarchates that had so often disputed her preëminence and opposed her claims. But when Okba swept Africa from the Nile to the ocean (669–

683), while Hasan delivered Carthage to the flames (698), she realized the danger at her own doors. "Great God," cried Okba, as he spurred his horse into the Atlantic, "if my course were not stopped by this sea I would go on to the unknown kingdoms of the West, preaching the unity of Thy holy name, and putting to the sword the rebellious nations who worship any other God than Thee." The ocean was impassable, so the Saracens turned aside into Spain, intent like Hannibal on the conquest of Europe and Rome from the West. By the fatal victory of Salado (Guadalete) (711), the Gothic monarchy was ruined; Roderic, the last ignoble successor of Alaric, perished in his flight; and Spain, which had resisted for two hundred years the arms of the Romans, yielded herself in a few months to the victorious Saracens. Only in the valleys of the Pyrenees and amid the mountains of the Asturias could a remnant of the Goths maintain their faith and freedom, and under the leadership of Pelayo (+737) repulse the forces of Islam, and lay the foundation of the future kingdom of Spain.

By the end of the first century after the Hegira[1] the empire of the caliphs was the greatest empire on the face of the earth. They reigned by the right of conquest from the Atlantic to the Indus; in the West, they threatened to cross the Alps, and conquer the Eternal City; in the East, Constantinople had already suffered two sieges at their hands.[2] Muhammad had

[1] The Hegira, or Flight of Muhammad, from Mecca to Medina, took place September 20, 622. But the Arabs date from July 16th.

[2] 1st, 674–676; 2d, 716–718.

declared war on the human race, and the human race and the Christian religion seemed destined to be crushed by his sword. The world *must make peace*[1] with the stronger, they must surrender to Allah. "Ye Christian dogs," cried Khalid, "ye know your option, the Quran, the tribute, or the sword." All along the coast of Africa, where once five hundred sees had gloried in the faith of Augustine and Cyprian, the light of the Gospel was totally extinguished. Church bells rang no more; in the early dawn, instead of the chanting of priests, the cry of the mueddhin rose in the sleeping cities:

> God is most great, God is most great,
> I testify there is no God but Allah.
> I testify Muhammad is God's messenger,
> Come ye and pray, come ye and pray;
> For prayer is better than sleep,
> There is no God but Allah.

In Spain, though toleration and half the churches had been granted to the Christians, six hundred mosques in the royal city of Cordoba proclaimed the dominant religion. In 718 the Arabs crossed the Pyrenees, and in successive swarms spread over the southern regions of France. But Abd-ar-rahman, their general, was not satisfied with these narrow limits. In 731 he invested Arles, and overspread Burgundy as far as Lyons and Besançon, slaughtering the Christians by thousands, and delivering their churches to the flames. In further campaigns he would carry the Quran to the Northern Ocean, and

[1] *Islam* and *Muslim* are the infinitive and participle of the causative form of the verb *slm*, which connotes peace.

teach its doctrines to the dwellers in Ultima Thule. But in a seven days' fight between Tours and Poictiers, which changed the history of the world (October 732), Charles the Hammer (Martel) and his Franks drove the nations of Africa and Asia before him in headlong flight, and wrested Southern France from their grasp. The Christianity of Europe was saved; never again would the caliphs have such an opportunity. The victors had been vanquished by the splendour and luxury of their conquests; their great empire was falling to pieces by its sheer weight. Unity was lost in a loose confederation; fanaticism extinguished in the greater hatred of contending dynasties, and in the bitter schism, which has rent Islam to this day, of Sunnee and Shiah.

In the West the Saracen attacks were henceforth rather the raids of pirates than the organized, far-reaching schemes of the early caliphs. Nevertheless, the light corsairs of the Saracens swept the Mediterranean, reduced Palermo (831), and gradually conquered the whole of Sicily (827–878). Throughout the island Christianity was almost uprooted. In 846 the Arab fleets entered the Tiber and sacked the churches, destroying the sepulchre of St. Paul, and breaking up the huge bronze coffin in which, according to universal belief, lay the mortal remains of St. Peter. A more formidable attack in 849 would have established their power in the heart of the Christian world, had not the vigilance of Pope Leo IV formed an alliance of the maritime republics of Gaieta, Naples, and Amalfi. By the naval battle of Ostia and the storm which completed the work of destruction, Rome was delivered from their dread. The

Papacy was saved; but the freedom of Italy was yet to be wrought. The Greeks, the Franks, and the Lombards contended together for the mastery, while Saracen fleets put out annually from Palermo and ravaged impartially the territories of all.

The West had scarcely begun to recover from the first shock of the barbarians, succeeded by its struggle with the Saracens, when the thirst for plunder woke again in North and East. Swarms of Vikings, secure in their command of the sea, descended on every coast, swept up the rivers to burn the inland towns, and destroyed with indifferent ferocity church, castle, monastery and village. For three centuries piracy became the common means of livelihood for a whole nation. "Deliver us, O Lord," ran the litany of the times, "from the frenzy of the Northmen." This was echoed in Germany and Italy by a similar prayer: "Deliver us, O Lord, from the frenzy of the Huns" (Magyars). Heathenism in the ninth and tenth centuries hurled itself in a last desperate rally on the Christian world. Thor, the favourite God of the wilder Norwegians, and Woden, in whose worship we recognize the more cultured notes of the south Germanic races, and misshapen Asiatic monsters struggled to overthrow the Cross.

II

The changes produced by the inrush of the barbarians were more than territorial. Many of the earlier invaders, it is true, of whom Theodoric the Goth may be taken as the noblest example, had been anxious to rule the Roman Empire rather than to destroy it. They were conscious still of the majesty

of Roman civilization. The rude peoples whom they led were still under the spell of her influence; they were prepared, at least nominally, to adopt her name, her religion, and her civilization, with such changes as might be necessary to meet their needs. The result was seen in the speedy if superficial conversion of such earlier invaders of the Empire as the Vandals and Franks. Their kings realized the need of consolidating their rule by assimilating the religion and civilization of the lands they had conquered. Possibly they might have succeeded in thus saving the older civilization had they not in their turn been exposed to attacks from new swarms. Successive onslaughts of the barbarians swept away not only Roman rule, but Roman civilization; this last in some lands, as for instance France, partially only, in others, for instance England, absolutely and forever, unless indeed the contention of some modern historians be correct that London persisted through all the changes, never losing her Roman character and importance. Roman law gave place to the customs of the tribes; Roman schools survived only in a few sheltered towns; the old Roman unity of speech gave place to a babel of languages; classic culture became lost for centuries; above all the "Pax Romana," the greatest gift which Rome had conferred on humanity, was exchanged for the confused struggle of tribe with tribe. Life everywhere, in all its forms, whether social or political, tended to slip back into barbarism. But for the Church the ruin would have been complete.

When in 482 the terrible Attila, after his defeat by the Visigoths at the battle of the Catelaunian fields

(Chalons), flung himself on Italy, the Romans, in their despair, sent the foremost of their citizens to implore the Hun to make peace and withdraw. With their senators they associated the venerable Leo, their bishop. The mission was successful; Attila and his Mongolian hordes retired to Pannonia. Later legends have claimed all the credit of this deliverance for the bishop of Rome. Leo is represented, for instance, in the paintings of Raffaele, as standing, with the great figures of St. Peter and St. Paul at his back, menacing with drawn sword and unutterable woes the trembling Hun. Which things are an allegory. In Leo, for whose person Attila probably felt little more reverence than for that of his fellows in the deputation, we salute the representative of the force which alone could subdue the barbarian. For we may boldly claim that the Church saved civilization; but for her missions and her influence this would have perished. To the same effect is the judgment of Harnack: "No flight of imagination can form any idea of what would have come over the ancient world had it not been for the Church."[1]

For, save in the Church, where shall we find, in the general welter of the times, a force sufficient to save civilization? Shall we turn to the new nations —Franks, Huns, Northmen and the like? Or, since this is unthinkable, shall we fall back upon the culture introduced into Europe by the Arabs; the arts and sciences which we owe to their inspiration? But unless we misread the whole history of the West, Eastern culture must always have formed an

[1] "Expansion of Christianity," Vol. I, p. 158.

alien element, the mark, at best, of Saracen conquerors. Its philosophy, potent though it became as an heretical force in the schools of Toledo and Paris, was too essentially Eastern in its pantheism to influence the West. As one of the elements absorbed by the awakening intelligence of Europe, Saracen culture had its value, though this has often been exaggerated; as a foundation for Western civilization and moral life it was impossible. Nor shall we rest on firmer ground if we seek for our sources of civilization in the scanty survival of the old Greek and Roman culture.

As a matter of fact the tragedy of the Church's task lay in the fact that not only had the political framework of life perished, but the very foundations of the older civilization had crumbled away. In the West the fall of *Hellenism* was complete. By Hellenism we understand that subtle pervasive influence of Greek thought and life, that emphasis of a Greek *kultur*, which, from the days of Alexander the Great until the sack of Rome, had been the most potent force in the higher life of the world. In its earlier days Hellenism had come into conflict with the racial and sacerdotal exclusiveness of Judaism, and, in the upshot, Judaism had been worsted. The Christian Church had been permeated with Hellenic thought; its theology interwoven with Hellenic strains. But that which the Jew could not succeed in doing the Barbarian accomplished. Slowly but surely Greek thought perished both in the Western Empire and from the Western Church, and the large comprehensive outlook of Greek theology became lost in a rigid Latin legalism. Here and there we find a soli-

tary witness to the old culture—John Scotus Eriugena in the ninth century, Grosseteste in the twelfth—but for all practical purposes they may be disregarded. The chief part of Greek culture which survived were a few fragments of somewhat hard and formal logic, and on these dry bones early Scholasticism was driven to subsist until the later rediscovery of Aristotle.

May we note in passing one evidence of the destruction of Greek culture? An essential part of Hellenism had been the care of the body, with its motto the *mens sana in corpore sano*. In every Hellenized town, even in Jerusalem itself, we find the Greek gymnasium, the centre and symbol of the Greek value of the body as such. The bath, and all the consequent cleanliness of home and person, was part of this culture, and had passed over to the Romans as an essential part of their life. But all this most valuable side of Hellenism was now destined to be lost. In place of the exaltation, oftentimes excessive, of the worth of the body we find its depreciation :—"this vile body," though a mistranslation, is a fairly accurate description of early mediæval thought. In place of the gospel of cleanliness we find the squalor and filth of early Monasticism. We may add that this lost conception of the value of cleanliness and the worth of the body, so prominent a feature in Greek culture, was never recovered by the mediæval Church. Great and many were her accomplishments, but this part of her task she left severely alone, or, rather, she showed herself altogether unconscious of any loss sustained.

If from Hellenism we turn to Roman civilization

we find a similar if lesser destruction. The extent of the survival of the Roman culture has often, it is true, been underestimated. In the darkest days of barbarian triumph there were still here and there, in Italy at least, Roman schools, and the traditions of Roman culture and law. These, like Roman roads, Roman aqueducts and bridges, were built too solidly to be swept away easily. But though surviving, their effect upon the life of the surrounding barbarians was but slight. We may take, for instance, Roman law, the codification of which by Justinian was the great legacy of the later Empire. The key to the existence of Lombard cities and Lombard schools lies in the continued recognition through the darkest ages of the old Roman system of jurisprudence. But the effect of Roman Law upon barbarians was almost nil until they had been Christianized. Only when the age of iron gave place to the first rude attempts at order could Roman Law reassert herself. Then indeed, as we shall see later, her influence was tremendous, both upon the common law of the new nations, and especially in the formation of the Canon Law of the Church. But this influence was secondary, not causal, the result of a suitable environment prepared by the Church. Without the civilization fostered by the Church the nations would never have turned from their rude codes to the more scientific jurisprudence of Justinian. For the question of the influence of Roman Law resolves itself into the struggle between the surviving Romanized and Christianized civic communities and the surrounding barbarian and heathen populations with their own codes. But for Christianity the struggle would have been unto

death; it was really the Christianity of the towns that won over the country pagans, and finally impressed upon them the need of law.

This reasoning is still more correct when applied to Roman schools and all the culture that Roman schools might be supposed to have fostered. The task of the Church in the matter of mediæval education is of such importance as to demand a lecture in itself. For the present it will suffice to note that, as might be expected, here and there the traditions of the old schools lingered on, in a few cases even the actual schools themselves. But the influence of this old culture as a civilizing element was lost, until the Church had done the spade-work which alone made it fruitful.

The loss of Roman schools and Roman education was not so serious as the loss of Roman discipline. With the incoming of the barbarian there passed away out of Europe all that solidarity, of which the basis was the consciousness of unity in the one great empire, the result the great discipline of life which had won Rome her marvellous triumph. In place of the Empire, with its ordered life and its emphasis on the unity of every part, we have the struggle of innumerable clans whose only consciousness of unity was that which came from a common instinct of destruction. The most marvellous thing in the old world had been the enormous assimilative power of Latin culture and Roman institutions, by which whole races of barbarians had been Romanized and united. But that assimilative power was now exhausted, while barbarism had burst upon the world with a positive energy for creating the local and un-

assimilated. In the Middle Ages, as we shall see later, we find a complex mass of diverse laws and customs, written and unwritten, Roman, Gothic, ecclesiastical, all struggling together, or dividing out their several spheres just as if no such thing as unity either in administration or ideal was either desirable or possible. Every attempt to give unity by political means, on the part of such great leaders as Charles the Great, always failed when the strong hand was removed. In the Church alone could the warring clans find the reality of unity; through the Church alone did the political unities that were attempted find a shadowy basis of fact in the concept of a Holy Roman Empire.

We have claimed that the idea of finding the great new civilizing factor in the life of the barbarian nations is unthinkable. The statement needs a certain qualification. In the successive swarms of barbarians the keenest eye can detect little but savagery, mitigated by frankness and bravery, and by a certain absence of the corruptions of the dying Roman world. Nevertheless the new nations formed a fine soil for the growth of a new culture; but the new culture was in every case planted there by the Church, in no case the product of internal, latent powers. We may take as an illustration the case of the Northmen. At the commencement of the ninth century they were still the terror and scourge of Christendom. Their drinking cups were oftentimes human skulls; their amusement to throw children into the air and catch them on the points of their spears. Human sacrifices were not unknown. Of one king we are told that he purchased long life by offering one of his sons

to Woden. But by the end of the tenth century the Norman pirates had forgotten their native land, its language and rough customs, and abandoned the worship of Woden for that of "the white Christ." The result was marvellous, both in the facts themselves and in the rapidity of their accomplishment. The new faith chastened and transformed into the beginnings of a new poetry the dreamy temperament which had thought of the thunder as the hammer of Thor, and heard in the wind the war-cry of Woden. Hence it is in Normandy that we first see the breaking of light in the dark ages. There the new and nobler spirit became a national enthusiasm. The adventurous spirit of the Northmen led them to send forth a gallant procession of soldiers of the Church. The deeds of daring of their forefathers were repeated on a nobler stage. Cruelty which had thought nothing of death became changed into a heroism that counted life itself to be but part of the necessary renunciation of the soldiers of Jesus. Monasteries arose in the densest forests, while the schools of Bec and Avranches might well be called, for a while, the universities of the West. Thus the energy of the Viking pirates, at the call of the Church, aroused Europe from the sleep of the Dark Ages, and ushered in a new dawn. But the force that made for civilization was the transforming touch of the Church.

One other matter should be noticed in this connection. The barbarian invasions roughly divide themselves into two distinct periods, in both of which it was a life and death struggle for civilization. But the first conflict would have been fatal had it not been that to some extent the barbarians had become

Christians before they burst in upon the Empire. Europe has not sufficiently recognized the debt she owes to the intrepid missionary Ulfilas (+380). The story of his labours falls outside the limits that we have assigned to our survey, but their results were lasting for centuries after his death. Through his devoted toils, above all by his translation of the Bible into their native language, Ulfilas won over the Goths and Visigoths beyond the Danube to allegiance to Christ. When therefore there took place the great migration of the Goths, which led ultimately to the overrunning of Italy, Spain, and Northern Africa, the conquerors, though still barbarians, were yet Christians. Though they were Arians, through the political accidents of the time rather than by any lapse on the part of Ulfilas, when they overturned the Empire they had no intention of overturning Christianity. Thus the invasions which produced the fall of the Empire to some extent strengthened the Church. But for the labours of Ulfilas the result would have been far otherwise. The Church, surviving its first struggle against extermination, would have been so weakened that she would not have had the strength—we speak after the manner of men—to overcome the great heathen invasions of the eighth and ninth centuries.

III

Before we close this introductory lecture there is a question to which we should do well to attempt an answer. The more the student ponders the fall of the Roman civilization, the more perplexed he is to

account for it. By this we do not refer merely to its external causes for those, whether internal or external, are plain. We allude to something more fundamental; what part did the Fall of the Empire play in the moral evolution of the world? Was the Fall a mere catastrophe of evil, a throw-back of civilization to primitive barbarism; or was the Fall after all an event in which we may see traces of the moral government of the Universe? Such a question is of the highest importance. Upon the answer we give to it depends the whole view we take of history. For the Fall of the Empire is, undoubtedly, the greatest event in human annals, the most tragic in its circumstances, the most momentous in its results. Either the Fall must have some moral justification, or else we must hold with Gibbon that history is but the record of the crimes and follies of humanity. In other words the Fall of the Empire brings us sharply face to face with the problem of Divine Government. That the greatest catastrophe of history should be wholly unrelated to moral causes would be a practical dethronement of God from a sovereign place in human affairs.

Now not many years ago, under the influence of German scholars, it was customary to give a somewhat glib answer to the difficulty thus raised. The Fall of the Empire was necessary, it was said, for only by the infusion of the new Teutonic blood could Europe find her higher self and the Church develop her true power. This crude Germanic optimism, or self-esteem, scarcely appeals to modern scholars; it savours too much of the doctrines of Treitschke, the superman of Nietsche, and the attempts made to

prove that all greatness comes from over the Rhine. We do not recognize in the hordes of Germans and other barbarians the saviours of the world. We are too deeply conscious to-day of all that they destroyed. No doubt new blood was necessary, and the barbarian invasions were not wholly evil. But considered as a surgical operation the price paid through long centuries for their rude cautery was altogether excessive.

The answer to the question is exceedingly difficult; the more so as the causes of the Fall itself are so obscure that there is still, in spite of the researches of recent years, no agreement among scholars. At present, under the influence of Schiller, the tendency is to dwell upon the financial causes, the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few, the disappearance of a middle class, the vast masses of slaves, the depopulation of the country by slave labour driving out the free farmer and the yeoman, the sapping of the vitality of the lower free classes by a system of doles and largesse and the like. All these were probably correct, and as contributory causes their importance cannot be exaggerated, especially the practical disappearance of the middle classes, and all the weakness thereby involved.

Further investigation is certainly needed of the economic issues of the age. Was the Fall of the Empire one of the results of that massing of men in towns which was one of the most remarkable results of the centuries of the Roman Peace? When a nation is cut off from the soil that nation is in peril of its existence. That such massing in the towns of free population was one issue of the slavery which con-

centrated estates in few hands, working the farms from gigantic *ergastula*, would explain at least one moral cause of the Fall. In the towns also what was the place of what the Americans call, as the result of a similar problem, "the poor white"? It is difficult to see how such vast cities as Carthage and Milan,—to say nothing of Rome—could have had an adequate economic basis. The industrial development which would have relieved the strain had been thwarted by the paramount fact of slavery. The problem of the idle rich is bad enough; the problem of the idle poor which slavery brings with it, especially when the slaves are freed, is worse.

Among the financial causes of weakness must also be noted the vast expenses of civic office in the second, much more in the third century of the Empire. To hold office with the cost it involved in providing games, gladiators, or other spectacles, was to involve oneself in financial ruin for all except the wealthiest. Others besides Christians caught at any means of escape from the intolerable burden. Some went so far as to unfit themselves for office by contracting marriage with a freed woman; others bought themselves out at a price. But the general result was the dropping out of the middle classes, and all the financial instability thereby involved. Granting however to the financial causes the fullest weight, nevertheless they seem utterly inadequate as a sufficient explanation of the greatest catastrophe in history. We must refuse to own that the dollar is the decisive factor in human affairs.

Neither do we find a solution if we turn to moral causes. At one time it was the custom, especially of

preachers, to paint in blackest colours the moral degeneracy and unbridled luxury of both the early and later Empire. The common mistake was made of taking the outpourings of satirists and moralists at their face value. For we must always remember that it is inevitable in the chronicles of an age that vice should be singled out, especially rare vice, and that virtue, especially commonplace virtue, should be neglected. The many glorious nights of summer have slight place in our memories or gratitude; one devastating storm stamps itself indelibly. So in history. There is not a century or epoch in which it is not possible to draw the blackest picture of moral decay and ruin, by concentrating attention upon the vice that obtrudes itself, and neglecting to discover the virtues which have neither annalist nor herald, but which were not the less real because silent.

This is especially true in the case of the Empire. Those who were discontented with the present were driven into satire, and, inasmuch as through political reasons they could not sketch a happier future without running the risk of treason, they were forced to contrast the sordid features of their generation with the fabled happiness of an age in the past that never existed. Even Nero himself, to say nothing of Tiberius, could scarcely have been quite so low and wicked as he is usually painted; if so it is difficult to account for the popularity he enjoyed, and the persistent belief among the people, alluded to by the author of the Apocalypse, that he would some day return to reign. We must discount therefore much of the positive evidence of moral disorder, especially in the cases where we are solely dependent on persecuted,

and consequently embittered, Christian writers, or upon political satirists; while, on the other hand, there are many indications of the existence of a normal moral life among the people at large. The recent discoveries in Egypt and elsewhere give no support to the idea of a vast moral degeneration among the people at large.

The difficulty of accounting for the Fall of the Empire is further increased when we remember that the Fall followed hard upon a distinct spiritual revival in the old Roman world. By this we do not refer to the growth of Christianity, but to the fact that the attempt of Christianity to obtain the mastery of the Empire coincided, it would appear, with an upward spiritual movement among mankind at large. The old heathen conceptions strove in many ways to adapt themselves to the enlarged spiritual and human outlook of a world which was no longer local in its instincts but imperial. The search of the philosophers for the universal principle in knowledge and thought had resolved itself, among the more thoughtful laity, into the desire to find some universal object of faith. The spirituality and high calling of Stoicism, as exemplified in Marcus Aurelius, or the slave Epictetus, is a commonplace of history. Less familiar is the growing spirituality which students have discovered, especially in the second century, in the three great rivals of the Christian faith: the worship of the Great Mother, the worship of Isis, and, above all, the worship of Mithra. These three religions, with the stress they laid on atonement, vicarious sacrifice, immortality, and mystic rapture, prepared the old world in more ways than

one for the religion which was to satisfy, at last, the hunger and thirst of humanity. At the same time they make it more difficult to account for the fall of the Empire. The influence of Stoicism upon the people may have been but slight, but Mithraism numbered its devotees by the thousands, even as far north as the Roman Wall in Northumberland, and was the special cult of Roman soldiers.

The Fall of the Empire remains the great mystery of history. But to acknowledge this is not to allow that history reveals that there may be cataclysms and catastrophes, unrelated to moral causes, whose upshot was the destruction of thriving civilizations. The Christian is necessarily an optimist; for him the watchword of humanity is progress; "it doth not yet appear what we shall be" is the inspired declaration of his hope. Progress, probably, is always in cycles, attended by times of reaction, but to believe that these cycles are without goal or moral direction is the negation of the Cross and the proclamation of chaos. The Fall of the Empire, therefore, just because it is the greatest catastrophe in history, cannot be unrelated to moral causes or government. We are bound by the convictions of our faith to assert that it was neither accidental nor without sequence of good, though we must at the same time confess that for our belief there is no sufficient demonstration.

Possibly the causes of the Fall may never be satisfactorily known. Doubtless there were factors in that fall the existence of which in that unscientific age were unnoticed or unrecorded, but which were absolutely vital in their consequences. One or two

of these may be indicated. What position for instance did the women of the age take up towards the burden of motherhood? That the nation which, under dreams of woman's emancipation or equality, or through love of ease, refuses that burden, is a doomed nation, is the accepted verdict of history; but we have no evidence sufficient for us to decide whether Rome fell because its women, especially in the governing classes, refused the burden of their sex.

Then again we have no records which would enable us to estimate the part played in the Fall by epidemics and other physical causes. The possible importance of this cause cannot be exaggerated. Only in the last thirty years have historians discovered the tremendous consequences, social, economic, political, and religious, of the Black Death of 1349. This appalling catastrophe not only swept away half the population of Europe, but left its mark on every aspect of the national life. In England, for instance, it contributed more than any other cause to the destruction of the old mediæval system of land tenure, while the monasteries never recovered from the burden of debt and depleted numbers which it inflicted upon them. We may safely say that but for the Black Death Henry VIII could not have carried out his policy of monastic destruction. Bearing in mind therefore the consequences which without exaggeration may safely be traced to the Black Death, we may ask whether or not there were similar events in the Roman world which have not perhaps received from historians their due attention. Take for instance malaria. The Campagna of Italy bears wit-

ness to this day of awful devastation caused by this plague, but in the days of Rome's greatness the Campagna was a smiling garden. Whence came the malaria? Was it due to preventable causes of a moral nature, as for instance the substitution of sheep farming and slave labour for the petty tillage of the old free yeomen, or did the malaria arise from general ignorance? Whether from one or the other, it is at least a tenable surmise, that has recently found strenuous advocates, that malaria may have played no small part in the destruction of both the Greek and the Roman cultures. What part also should be assigned to the plague which in the middle of the third century ravaged the provinces of the Empire for fifteen years in succession, carrying off in Alexandria and other cities more than half the population. Seasons of scorching drought followed by terrific tornadoes, famine, earthquakes and huge tidal waves completed the ruin. The struggle with nature is not new. Nor is it fatal unless the national will has been weakened by luxury or bad government, or, as is the case in Mesopotamia, the fatalism of Islam has extinguished effort.

We may frankly own that the problem of the Fall of the Western Empire is incapable of solution with the existing materials. It may perhaps lessen the problem, at any rate for the Christian, if we enquire what would have been the fate of the Church had the Empire survived, not as a mere ghost of its former self, but in its old majesty and power. The Papacy, of course, would have been condemned to play a part in the world of much the same importance as the bishops of Antioch or Alexandria. But with all its

defects the historian must own that for long centuries the Papacy was the greatest force that made for righteousness that the world knew. More pertinent is it to ask whether Christianity itself could have acquired any real hold in the Roman Empire, whether for instance there was not an essential antagonism between Cæsar and Christ, between the fundamental concepts of the Empire and the Church. We believe it may be legitimately argued that in a strong Empire true to itself and its leading principles, Christianity was impossible, unless indeed it were willing to reduce itself to the level of a mere philosophical opinion which, like Stoicism or Neoplatonism, might be held by the cultured few, but which made few attempts to proselytize the masses, or to alter radically the structure of society. For Christianity, at any rate in its earlier and purer days, the fashionable syncretism of philosophy, in which Plutarch and other thinkers found solace, was a sheer impossibility. With sublime audacity the followers of Jesus proclaimed that Christ must be all in all. Christianity emblazoned on its banners its loathing and disdain for the cults around. But toleration for local cults of every sort, provided they were not harmful to the State or detrimental to morals, was an essential principle of Roman policy. Roman toleration in fact was merely a matter of political expediency. For the Church in the Empire toleration was an impossibility. A Christianity that was willing to accommodate itself to the heathenism around would never have conquered the world.

The reader will not fail to notice one result. The imperial toleration was a local matter, if only for the

simple reason that polytheism was essentially a local matter. Each god had his rights, within certain areas; but each god must be careful to respect the rights of his neighbour. To ignore this rule would lead to chaos, or rather to the end of the whole system. Now a universal faith, provided it makes any real demands on its devotees, must come into conflict with polytheism. The claims of the local and of the universal cannot be conciliated. We see this in later days in the case of Muhammad. The same thing was illustrated even more abundantly in the rise of the Church. The Christians were not persecuted because of their creed, but because of their universal claims. For monotheism, viewed merely as a philosophy, the Romans had some sympathy. But a monotheism which refused to allow place for others must be brushed aside as a political nuisance or an "atheistic" monster. This universality of claim, this aggressiveness of temper, this consciousness from the first of world-wide dominion—in a word, all that in later days was summed up in the title of Catholic—was the inevitable cause of the imperial persecution of the Christians. Neither the Church nor the Empire could act otherwise save by running contrary to their true genius. The failure to understand this essential opposition lies at the root of the constant complaints of Christian apologists as to the different treatment measured out to them and "to the men who worship trees and rivers and mice and cats and crocodiles." It has also obscured for many church historians the real meaning of persecution itself, as a matter rather of political necessity than of mere love of cruelty.

We should thus err greatly if we looked upon the dissolution of the old Roman world as altogether loss. With the Fall of the Empire there had passed away much that was harmful, as well as more that was valuable. Gone for instance was the apotheosis of Cæsar, and in the worship of Cæsar the Church ever recognized its most potent foe. I need scarcely remind you of what was meant by this, and of its results. Augustus, the better to work out those ideas of universal citizenship, equality, and government for which the Empire stood, had found it necessary to institute or rather develop a common religion to give a unity to provinces otherwise diverse in creed, language and custom. This common worship of Rome and Augustus was the beginning of a universal Church with a priesthood, sacrifices, and temples of its own, very similar and yet very different in conception and aim from the Catholic Church with which it was destined to come into conflict. The development of this worship had speedily become a fixed part of the imperial economy. Against this worship the Christians alone had stood out with unvarying hostility. No patriotic words as to the Genius of the Empire, no sophisms of the elder Pliny that "for a mortal to help mortals is the essence of deity," no philosophic subtleties about the divine life of the State and its connection with an unseen order, could deceive the Christian into forgetting the degradation for God and man alike of this system of apotheosis. He saw clearly the insult to God; the putting the Genius of the Empire in the place of Divine Providence, the attributing to man prerogatives which belong solely to the Almighty. He realized the degradation of man resulting from

thus fixing the worship of men upon one of themselves, however exalted. He knew that in all ages a man's views of his god are the measures of his ideals for himself and his neighbour. He was aware of all that could be said in its favour by Plutarch and other philosophic writers; that it was a symbol of unity, the "keystone of the imperial policy," an incarnation of the race's solidarity, the recognition of a divine foundation for order and empire, and the like.

Such specious arguments did not move him. For the Christian there was but one Lord and Master to whom he owned supreme allegiance; this he was prepared to prove by the renunciation of all things, even life itself. For the Christian the unity of the race was symbolized, not by a Tiberius or a Marcus Aurelius, but by the incarnation of Jesus Christ; in the Man Christ Jesus alone was the hope of humanity. This apotheosis of Jesus, to look at the matter for the moment from the standpoint of the heathen philosopher, he claimed to be on a different footing from the apotheosis of Claudius or Vespasian. Leaving on one side all question of character, the one was the apotheosis of a supreme renunciation, the other the idolatry of success. And there is nothing so fatal in the long run to all higher instincts and aspirations as the idolatry of success, whether in the form of a second-century emperor or a twentieth-century millionaire.

But with the Fall of the Empire all this, in the West at least, passed away, though it still lingered on in spirit in the Eastern Empire. The gain to humanity was immense. Mere local heathenism could be destroyed or overcome; the worship of Rome and

Augustus was a policy based upon political necessities; its overthrow could only be accomplished by the destruction of the Empire itself. The results of the overthrow may be deplored, until we remember that no future of progress and hope could lie before a world whose unity was still based on the worship of Cæsar, or any other mortal all-highest.

Another gain for the world from the Fall of the Empire lay in the dethronement of the Roman idea that the State as such was absolute and supreme, above all law, and with a complete claim upon the souls as well as the bodies of each of its citizens. By Roman theory the State was the one society which must engross every interest of its subjects, religious, social, political, humanitarian, with the one possible exception of the family. There was no room in Roman law for the existence, much less the development on its own lines of organic growth, of any corporation or society which did not recognize itself from the first as a mere department or auxiliary of the State. The State was all and in all, the one organism with a life of its own.

This Roman concept—almost identical in expression and aim to its modern imitation, the German *kultur*—had worked marvels in the reducing chaos to order, and bringing in efficiency, but in the process it had reduced the individual to a valueless unit, just as does its modern representative, however efficient and orderly may be the other results of the system. The elimination from the ideas of Europe of this conception of a state above law was a priceless gain. In its place there arose, it is true, the struggle of individual nations striving to express themselves

in their own way, but it was through this very struggle that we can trace the rise of individual liberty. So little was the State as such above law, irresponsible, that the fundamental conception of the dominant State, the Holy Roman Empire, was a responsibility, not the less real because ill-defined, of its secular head or emperor to its spiritual head, the pope. How deadly was the Roman idea of an irresponsible State, an end of worship in itself and as such to be treated as divine, how great the deliverance of Europe by its overthrow we may see in the woes that have resulted from the revival in a new form of the old Roman idea by Machiavelli at the Renaissance, its enthusiastic adoption in modern Germany by Treitschke and other professors. All the evils which have come to Europe from the logical carrying out of a theory which puts the State *über alles*, even above law and God, only demonstrate how right were the early Christians when they chose death itself rather than acknowledge for one moment the divinity of Rome and Augustus. The cycle of time has brought back once more with added horrors the Roman state-kultur; once more, through the martyrdom of nations and not as of old of individuals only, must the world be delivered from this fatal barrier to individual liberty.

IV

If the problem of the fall of the Western Empire is insoluble for those who would demonstrate adequate moral causes, still more difficult is the problem of the fall of the Eastern Empire and the triumph of Islam. How was it, the reader may ask, that the

original centres of Christianity so speedily succumbed to the unitarian, that Alexandria, Carthage, Antioch, Ephesus, Constantinople,—names forever illustrious for the one-time virility of their Christian thought, and their lasting contributions to the Christian faith —became both lost to the Cross and in some cases lost to civilization as well. No satisfactory answer is possible : Even more than the Fall of the Western Empire the devastation of the Eastern and African churches is a mystery that taxes faith. Nevertheless historical enquiry will reveal certain causes for the conquest of Islam.

Islam conquered because the caliphs who succeeded Muhammad in spite of their burning zeal exercised a shrewd "toleration," taking care, of course, not to read into this word modern English or American ideas, but to understand it relatively to the age. By the laws of the faith polytheists and idolaters might be exterminated, but as a matter of fact the Muhammadan conquerors of India have always spared its temples. In all countries also, except in Arabia itself where no faith was permitted but Islam, the Muslims, however much they might despise, always tolerated the Jew or the Christian. On the payment of a moderate tribute the conquered who refused to conform were entitled to the freedom of conscience and religious worship. In Syria their churches were not taken from them. After the conquest of Damascus in 635 half of the churches were allotted to the Christians ; it was not until eighty years later that the great cathedral was made a mosque through the gradual decline of the Christian population. There were other causes of the extension of Islam. As

Gibbon has pointed out "in a field of battle the forfeit lives of the prisoners were redeemed by the profession of Islam; the females were bound to confess the religion of their masters, and a race of sincere proselytes was gradually multiplied by the education of the infant captives. But the millions of African and Asiatic converts who swelled the native bands of the faithful Arabs must have been allured rather than constrained to declare their belief in one God and the apostle of God. By the repetition of a sentence and the loss of a foreskin, the subject or the slave, the captive or the criminal, arose in a moment the free and equal companion of the victorious Moslems. Every sin was expiated, every engagement was dissolved; the vow of celibacy was superseded by the indulgence of nature; the active spirits who slept in the cloister were awakened by the trumpet of the Saracen; and, in the convulsion of the world, every member of a new society ascended to the natural level of his capacity and courage."[1]

Now these causes cannot be regarded as moral; they made their appeal to the unregenerate man. It is only when we come to contrast this easy-going proselytism with the deadly intolerance of the Church in the East, that we see wherein lay a great weakness. In the East the controversies that raged round the various symbols of the faith had degenerated into obstinate and sanguinary struggles, in which one party pillaged and murdered another in the name of the profound mysteries of the Incarnation and of the Trinity. From the secular point of view the Council of Chalcedon (451), with its seeming settlement of a

[1] Gibbon, Vol. V, p. 487.

long theological controversy, was a great misfortune for the Empire. The disunion of the East to which it led was one of the immediate causes of the triumph of Islam. Whole provinces of the Empire were driven by persecution into disaffection. Men, wearied by the endless struggles concerning metaphysical niceties, with the ready fatalism of the East, accepted, if they did not welcome, a creed forced upon them from without, which ended the conflict by remorselessly reducing all to acquiescence in a new doctrine whose rigid monotheism admitted of no debate. Islam conquered because of the weariness of a world which had lost the living Christ in endless controversies as to His Person. When the great Justinian, whose whole ecclesiastical policy was as great a series of mistakes as his Church of Santa Sophia at Constantinople was a masterpiece of architecture, undertook to establish the unity of the Christian faith with fire and sword, he really prepared the way for the destruction of the faith itself. The same mistake was made at a later date by the emperor Heraclius. Heraclius, one of the greatest generals the world has ever seen, saved the East from the Persian invasion. In victory after victory he wrested Egypt and Palestine from Chosroes (620), but when the greater peril of Islam arose, Heraclius had estranged Egypt by becoming the persecuting tool of Sergius the patriarch of Constantinople.

In a word the grave of the Empire was dug by a fanatical, persecuting Orthodoxy. The powerful Monophysites and Monothelites of the East might be compelled by the forces of the Empire nominally to renounce their heresies; in reality they clung to them

still, and only awaited their opportunity. The Fall of the Eastern Empire, the direct result of ecclesiastical disunion, gave to these sects a continued if struggling existence. They found under the ægis of Islam a rest and protection that had been denied them by the dominant Greek Church. The Maronites, Jacobites, Nestorians, Armenians and Copts of Asia Minor, Mesopotamia and Egypt are not only the feeble survivals of once powerful theological schools; they are the constant reminder by their existence in the midst of Muhammadan peoples of the disintegrating forces of religious intolerance. In Egypt, for instance, where theological feuds raged fiercest, thousands of turbulent Coptic monks were prepared to lay down their lives for a clause or a word in the definition of a dogma, yet accepted, almost without a struggle, the Muslim conquerors—even if we reject the story of the treachery of a mysterious Christian ruler called the "Mukaukas," whom some writers have identified with the Melchite patriarch of Alexandria. Whatever the truth of this tale, for the Coptic or native Egyptian Church the Arab invasion was almost a relief from the intolerant tyranny of Constantinople, abetted by the dominant Greeks of Alexandria.

Nor must we overlook in this connection the fatal effects, especially in Egypt, of Monasticism. With the undoubted services of Monasticism to civilization in the Western world we shall deal in a later lecture, but in the East the services were few, the mischievous effect without question. In Egypt, especially, the strongly-marked individualism of Monachism not only led it into excesses and extravagances of as-

cetıcism that disgraced human nature itself, but also into a fatal indifference if not antagonism to the interests of the State. To account for this is not difficult. In its first origins Christianity had lain over against the State because of its parousian conceptions. In the first enthusiasm of their chiliastic hopes the Christians had a tendency to forget the duties they owed to the State. The claims of the old "world" that was "passing away, with the fashion thereof," and of the new world that men "greeted from afar" were not easy to adjust. Synchronizing with the decay of parousian belief we have the rise of Monasticism, in which the adjustment was even less successful. In Monasticism, in fact, we find antagonism to the State one of the primal elements, an indifference or hostility at which we need not wonder, if we remember the then circumstances of the State against which it revolted. For the Empire, whatever may be said as to the causes, was slowly sinking into ruin, both from weakness within, bad methods of finance, a poverty-stricken middle class, the concentration of all wealth in the hands of a few, a hopeless bureaucracy, the stereotyping of all society into hereditary castes, an army of hireling barbarians—more terrible to its masters than to its enemies—and by attacks from without. The despotism of the Empire "as it grew old became at once feebler and more vexatious, exhausting a world which it could not even defend. It weighed upon all, and protected none."[1] "The ancient world," writes Harnack, "had arrived, by all the routes of its complicated development, at the bitterest criticism of and disgust at its own ex-

[1] Montalembert, "Monks of the West," Vol. I, p. 197.

istence."[1] The fabric of Roman society and administration in the fourth and fifth centuries was honeycombed by moral and economic vices. Christianity had not as yet cured evils, so much as made the more thoughtful conscious of their presence, and of the tremendous organized system which seemed bound up with them. Of the fourth and fifth centuries, equally with the first, is the description of Arnold true:

> "On that hard, pagan world
> Disgust, and secret loathing fell;
> Deep weariness, and sated lust,
> Made human life a hell."

A protest was bound to come and when it came to take the form of a reaction from the State to the individual. We see a similar revolt in the early days that followed the break up of Greek civic independence, and the substitution of imperialism. Philosophers despaired of the republic, and found a new subject for thought in the individual man. So once again a protest was made, no longer by schools of Stoics and Epicureans, but by the noblest souls within the Church. Unfortunately the protest became a counsel of despair. That serviceable men were withdrawn from the service of the army might have been viewed with indifference; that so many men of brains and character were withdrawn from civic and domestic life, at a time when their services would have been invaluable in the defense of civilization and Christianity itself, was a disaster nowhere felt more than in Egypt and Syria. There the rush

[1] Harnack, "History of Doctrine," Vol. III, p. 127.

to the monasteries, or to the solitudes of the desert, ultimately resolved itself into the suicide of a nation.

Another unfortunate cause of weakness in the Eastern Empire, explanatory therefore of the triumph of Islam, was the iconoclastic controversy. After the loss of Syria and Egypt the further encroachments of Islam were arrested by one of the greatest of Eastern emperors, Leo the Syrian,[1] by birth a rough peasant of Asia Minor, and by Leo's son Constantine V. Unfortunately Leo was not content with his military task. Like Heraclius, and with the same fatal results, he plunged into ecclesiastical controversy. The crusade of Leo against the "eikons" or sacred pictures was only part of his general programme for infusing new life into the realm, driving back the Saracens, and recovering the lost provinces of the Cross. To attribute to Leo heretical notions, *e. g.*, the denial of the humanity of Christ, is a charge without proof. On the other hand it is probable that he considered that the victorious career of Islam was due to her hatred of idolatry. Islam would neither allow images nor even copies of natural objects. Leo determined to make use of the same secret of strength. But Leo was before his age, alike in his desire for a less superstitious Christianity, in his abolition of serfdom, and his efforts to develop a strong yeomanry by a reform of the land laws. The evils sanctified by time could not be corrected even by his master hand. His attempted religious reforms were mere personal movements, antagonistic to all popular feeling; nor did he attempt to substitute a living enthusiasm in the

[1] Commonly but erroneously called the Isaurian.

place of the superstition he destroyed. After a long struggle iconoclasm failed, and the images were restored, chiefly through the agency of female sovereigns. The consolidation which had been the work of the great iconoclasts produced its results in large acquisitions from the Saracens, by the Basilian dynasty (867–1057), of lost territories both in Asia and Europe. But the persecuting tyranny of the Iconoclasts had estranged the people from sovereigns who might otherwise have consolidated the forces of the Empire. The Empire was torn asunder just at a time when it most needed its full strength.

In Spain also—another great centre of Islam conquest as Dr. Hodgkin has pointed out—the Church had drawn to itself the whole power of the State and was chiefly concerned with uprooting Judaism. "Shem was to take a fearful revenge. True the revenge came not from the race of Isaac, but from their kinsmen of the deserts. But there can be no doubt that the rapid success of the Saracens was due in part at least to their secret understanding with the Jews. The soil was mined under the feet of its Gothic lords."

Thus the victory of Islam, though still a mystery, is not yet wholly unrelated to moral causes. Broadly stated, it was the triumph in a new debased form of the old Jewish monotheism against a church which had buried the living Christ in a grave of words; at the same time it was the accommodation of religion to the common man. Such accommodation could never have been won in a Church which had not already lost touch with the spiritual realities. The victory was completed when Muhammad granted to

his Christian subjects the security of their persons, the freedom of their trade, and a limited toleration of their worship. By this astute, though temporary, move Islam secured the mastery over the divided and warring creeds of the Cross greater than any that could have been purchased by the sword. And it is still the divided state, as in the days of the crusade, that gives Islam such power as she still possesses.

LECTURE II

THE DAWNING OF THE MISSIONARY CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE CHURCH

LECTURE II

THE DAWNING OF THE MISSIONARY CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE CHURCH

I

IN our last lecture we dwelt at some length upon the extent of the task which awaited the Church as the result of the barbarian invasions, and of the fall of the Empire. In our present lecture we shall confine ourselves to the efforts made by the Church to bring the heathen within her fold. For it is the chief glory of the Church, both in the East and West, that amid all weakness and faults her sons have never forgotten the last commission of Jesus. Nor will the student inquire too carefully what measure of self-seeking and political aggrandizement may have been mixed with her purer motives. He will recognize that in the harvest-field of Christ the tares and the wheat grow together; that not all is good, while all is far from being evil. We will rejoice over the conquests of the Cross, that notwithstanding every way Christ is preached; though he may mourn over the wide difference which separates the holiest of the soldiers of the Church from the one Divine Pattern.

You will not expect from me any detailed study of the various missions, or of the heroes of the Cross whom they produced. The subject alone would demand a book; a single lecture would be absurdly

inadequate. We must content ourselves with pointing out the main features and results of the missionary movements of the early Middle Ages.

The first matter that we should note is this. In the mission-field, as in life in general, the tide of advance is invariably followed by periods of ebb. The Church, as much as the individual, seems incapable of living for long in a state of intense spiritual earnestness, without suffering the inevitable reaction. But for this reaction there is another cause besides the psychological. The periods of missionary advance are periods of picturesque activity which arrest attention by their great personalities. Such advance is useless unless followed by a period of consolidation, none the less valuable because monotonous. The pioneers who first blazed their way through the virgin forests of your mighty continent, crossed the mountains to the blue grass of Kentucky, or caught sight of the great Father of Waters, have left names behind them enshrined forever on the pages of history. Not so with those who following in their steps settled the country, turning the wilderness into a garden, and the prairies into cities crowded with culture. So with the Church. The great missionary pioneers are immortal, nor do we lessen their renown when we point out the centuries of more humdrum work which necessarily followed their activity. But the toilers in these centuries are for the most part voiceless and unknown. Yet their works do follow them.

Christian missions form themselves into certain well-defined epochs. There was first of all the great effort, which we owe above all to the genius of St. Paul, to win the Roman Empire for the Cross. But that mis-

sion falls outside our period. Suffice to note in passing one matter that will arise in our consideration of other missions. Christianity conquered the Empire by weapons that were not altogether spiritual. When Constantine adopted Christianity as the religion of the State, the Christians, relatively speaking, were few in number. If we estimate the population of the Empire as between fifty and sixty millions, the Christians in the Empire at the moment of their triumph did not form one-tenth of the whole. They were, in fact, less numerous than the Jews. But that great opportunist Constantine made the religion of this small section the religion of the whole Empire because it was the only religion, except the outworn apotheosis of Rome and Augustus, that was capable of becoming universal. But vast as might seem to be the gain of the Church, there was corresponding loss. Hitherto Christianity had been a church of martyrs and enthusiasts, and the key-note had been pitched accordingly. Now it became the cult of a multitude of conformists upon whose life and morals it had little real hold. If the new Constantinople was from the first a Christian city, yet in Rome herself, for long years after the nominal conversion of the Empire, paganism was still the professed creed of the majority of the Senate, while in the country parts paganism, nominally abandoned, entrenched herself, with little change, in the Church itself.

Turning away from the Empire to our proper subject we note that the first missionary successes of the Church were won by heretics. We have already referred to the work of Ulphilas the Arian apostle of the Goths (c. 360). He was the forerunner of those

missionaries who won over to the faith the Burgundians in Gaul, the Suevi in Spain, the Vandals in Africa, and the Ostrogoths in Pannonia. These missionaries for the most part, whether from conviction or from political pressure, were Arians, and Arianism was thus adopted as the national faith of the warlike converts who had overthrown the Western Empire.

The success of these Arian missionaries is not difficult to explain. The temper and understanding of the new converts were not adapted to the metaphysical subtleties of the so-called Athanasian Creed. Arianism with its reduction of Christ to a demi-god, with its popular methods of appeal, including much use of song, with its facile logic that seemed to explain the unthinkable, found as quick a response among the heathen as it had already achieved in the Empire, among the thousands of nominal converts to Christianity. For the barbarian it was a half-way halting place in their conversion to Christianity. Arianism was really an accommodation to heathen conceptions. For the pagan of culture the question at issue was whether two weaker and subordinate gods, holding their existence precariously at the will of the Father, very little different from the philosophical triad or duad of Philo, Plotinus and the Neoplatonists, should be interposed between the diety and mankind. For in plain English that was really the meaning of the Arian formula as regards Christianity ἦν ὁτε οὐκ ἦν "there was when He was not" —with its necessary consequence as to the Holy Spirit, in spite of all refinements about leaving out the conception of time and the rest. Now such a

conception did not differ fundamentally from the heathen idea of a supreme Zeus or Woden with their lesser attendant deities. Carlyle, certainly no prejudiced observer, was right when he stated: "If Arianism had won, Christianity would have dwindled into a legend." Nevertheless, just because it was a half-way house, Arianism had its mission. When that was accomplished it vanished.

For this supersession of Arianism there were many causes. We may believe that just as the Church of the Empire was driven in spite of herself to eradicate the Arian taint, so sooner or later any Arian nation had to purge itself of heresy or vanish from the earth. Certain it is that though Arianism has again and again in diverse forms laid its spell on the thoughtful, yet it has never succeeded in holding the allegiance of the many. Nations and congregations which have embraced it have for the most part withered away.

Historically we may trace the decay of Arianism to the power of the Salian Franks. At the age of twenty the precocious genius of Clovis (Chlodoweg) overthrew the last remains of Roman power in Gaul, then turned to carry on a great war with the Alemanni of the southeast. He vowed to accept the faith if the White Christ would give him the victory. The victory came, the "White Christ" was evidently the mightier God. So on Christmas Day 496 Clovis and three thousand of his warriors were solemnly received into the Church at Rheims. The eloquent Remigius held up before him the cross: "Adore," said he, "that which you have hitherto burned, burn the idols that you have hitherto adored." As the Bishop

enlarged on the passion and death of Jesus, Clovis could restrain himself no longer. "Had I," he burst out, "been present at the head of my valiant Franks, I would have revenged his injuries."

The baptism of Clovis was the result of superstition. He had embraced Christianity because of its stronger supernatural support. His orthodoxy was a matter of political calculation. By the help of the Catholic Church he determined to overthrow his rivals, Visgoths, Ostrogoths, Vandals, and Burgundians, all of whom were Arians. When in 507 he attacked the Visgoths, "it is a shame," he is reported to have said, "that these Arians should hold a part of Gaul; let us attack them with God's help and take their land." Thus a religious sanction was given to his ambition, while his restless but orthodox sons and grandsons extended his rule from the forests of Thuringia and Bavaria to the ocean. But the supreme triumph of the Franks, as well as their greatest service to Christianity, was when in 732 Charles Martel brought the green standard of the Prophet to a halt upon the Loire, and so saved Europe from the Muslim domination.

The successful missions of other unorthodox branches of the Church besides the Arian must not be overlooked. Prominent among these we place the Nestorians. Persecuted in the Greek Empire they turned to the East and scattered missionary sees over a vast area of Central and Eastern Asia. In Syria, Armenia and Arabia, on the shores of the Caspian, in Great Tartary where in 1274 Marco Polo found two Nestorian churches still existing, and in distant China itself, they established centres of Chris-

tianity that have long since been swept away in the deluge of Mongolian invasions, or stamped out by the Muslim. The most important of the Nestorian missions that still exist is the ancient Christian Church of Malabar, the origin of which is assigned by local tradition to St. Thomas the Apostle, but which really was the work of a Nestorian missionary of the same name. In the sixth century a noted traveller, the merchant Cosmas of Alexandria, found in Ceylon, to his surprise, another congregation of Persian Christians, *i. e.*, of exiled Nestorians. Even more interesting is the testimony to their activity in China. In 1625 the Jesuits discovered a large tablet at Signanfu, the old capital of China, which set forth in Syriac and Chinese the story of a Nestorian mission. From this tablet we learn later that in 636 a missionary named Olopan came from Syria, was lodged in the imperial palace, and established a church which met with much success. Sixty years later there arose a great persecution which lasted for fourteen years. Then again there was peace, and a period of considerable prosperity. But of all that early Chinese Christianity there is now no survival save this tablet. The great work of the conversion of China, which made so fair a start, more than 1,000 years ago, has still to be accomplished.

II

In the more orthodox conflict of Christ and heathenism we note three centres of missionary activity. Constantinople claimed the East, and Rome the West, but for a while Rome was forced to share her conquests with Armagh. The story of the Irish

missions is one of the most interesting pages of sacred history. In Italy, France, and Spain, Christianity had almost exhausted itself in its struggle with barbarian and Saracen. Ireland, whose miseries were yet to come, alone seemed to preserve unimpaired the light and life of the early faith. This was her golden age; her familiar title was the island of "the saints." But the "saints," whether of the First, Second, or Third order, almost without exception were hermits and monks. Irish Christianity was essentially "monastic" Christianity, in which the bishop as such had little authority, and where "monasticism" was but another name for the community life of the clan turned religious, with the head of the clan as the abbot of the monastery or group of monasteries, *e. g.*, Clonmacnoise or Glendalough—for the clan could not dwell in one building or place, especially with the lapse of years. But just because of this very "monasticism" the Irish Church was essentially a missionary Church. The enormous number of inmates in these grouped monasteries, 2,000 at Bangor, 5,000 at Clonfer, and so on, compelled them to leave. Just as in later years the Irish were driven over the seas as emigrants to the New World by the narrow exigencies of life in the old home, so these huge clan-monasteries, unable to support their numbers, shed their more adventurous spirits.

This emigration of the saints was possible through a special feature of Celtic Monasticism. In the Monasticism of the West there was no law upon which greater insistence was placed, especially after Benedict, than that of "stability," *i. e.*, the fixed domicile of the monk. The wandering monk was sternly sup-

pressed—until, indeed, he reappeared with papal sanction in the wandering friar. But in Celtic Monasticism we are struck from the first with its extraordinary restlessness—in many respects, no doubt, the reflection of the general restlessness of the Celtic populations, especially in Ireland. A nomad at home, the Scoto-Irish colonized the northern parts of Scotland in the fifth and sixth centuries, giving to that land, hitherto known as Caledonia, his own Irish name, while traces of his wanderings a thousand years before the Christian era are found in the burial mounds of Scandinavia. Of this restlessness the typical hero is the monk Brendan (+577), who crossed the ocean "through a thick fog" that he might find an earthly paradise "beyond which shone an eternal clearness."[1] From the greater monastic settlements of Wales and Ireland there poured forth a succession of Celtic enthusiasts who carried their religion and their monasticism to far-off places the names of which still preserve their memories. Chief of these we may instance St. David, by whom, it was believed, twelve monasteries in succession were founded; to whom, above all others, has gone forth the reverence of the Welsh.

In this restlessness Celtic Monasticism was powerfully assisted by a current political movement. In the fifth century, owing first to Pictish and Irish invasions, followed at a later date by pressure from the

[1] It may interest an American audience to know that the tale of Brendan's two voyages was worked up into a popular romance by Irish monks on the Lower Rhine in the early part of the eleventh century. As this became very popular in Spain it may have inspired Columbus.

Saxons, and from the distress caused by a great plague in 547, we find a steady emigration of the British to Armorica, a land henceforth to be known under its new name of Brittany. The leaders in this emigration were monks, and the witchery of their lives—that constant witchery of Monasticism, to us, perhaps, so inexplicable, to the early and mediæval Church so real—drew others after them. The emigrating saints were usually accompanied by numerous followers. They found Armorica largely a desert, almost wholly heathen, its cities burned without inhabitant, made desert by the Empire itself, owing to many years of crushing imperial taxation extorted by selfish officials, and because of the ravages of barbarian hordes. In the dense forests that ran down to the coast the British monks established their clearings or *lans*, in which their rude huts and chapels mark the beginning of later villages that bear to this day the names of these first settlers.

Even more conspicuous than Britain in its missionary and monastic enterprises was the Celtic Church in Ireland. In the sixth century we find the Irish Church, untroubled by the disasters which were overwhelming the sister island, full of activity and resource. Embracing Christianity with Celtic ardour, the Irish monasteries became, for a while, the centres in the West of ancient civilization and learning, retaining even some knowledge of Greek, a language almost unknown elsewhere. In the early years of the ninth century whoever knew Greek on the Continent was either an Irish monk or taught by an Irish monk. The last representative of the Greek spirit in the West and one of the earliest torch-bearers in the

long line of Christian mystics, by his very greatness unintelligible to the men of his generation, was John Scotus Eriugena the Erin-born, who about the year 847 drifted from Ireland and settled at the court of that patron of scholars, Charles the Bald.

In the middle of the sixth century, especially, we note a wonderful outburst of Irish enthusiasm. Monastery after monastery was founded, and from these there poured out a succession of daring missionaries. In their flimsy coracles they crossed the stormy seas to Brittany, where, among the Breton saints of the sixth and seventh centuries, we find more than a dozen whose names are Irish. Others sought for seclusion from the world by escaping to the barren islands off the western coast of Ireland where the roar of the Atlantic and the screams of the gulls alone would disturb their devotions. When these became crowded with devotees they put out into northern seas that they might find some new desert in the ocean. The Hebrides, the Orkneys, the Shetlands, even lonely St. Kilda and distant Iceland itself were all reached by these adventurous wanderers, who carried everywhere their Irish monasticism as well as their Irish culture and their Irish manuscripts.

Some of these wandering Irish missionary-monks deserve the passing tribute of our mention. From the Faroe Islands and Iceland to the plains of Italy, from the shores of the ocean to the sources of the Rhine and the Danube, we find them everywhere, working with an enthusiasm that must not be judged by the absence of permanence in their results. The reputed pioneer of the host was Fridolin, whose Irish

birthplace is unknown. From Poictiers, his first halting-place, he passed by the Moselle and Strasburg, founding churches dedicated to St. Hilary, first to Glarus, a canton in Switzerland which still retains in its coat of arms the trace of his presence, and finally to Sackingen, near Basle, where he built a double monastery of monks and nuns of the usual Celtic type.

Towards the close of the sixth century we come across the greatest of these missionaries, Columba and Columban. Columba, the descendant of Irish kings, in whose character we see at all times the imperiousness of his high birth, was born at Gartan, among the mountains of Donegal (7th Dec. 521). On his baptism he changed his name of Crimthann or "wolf" for that of Colum or "dove." After founding sundry monasteries in the north of Ireland, Columba, desiring to go into exile for the sake of Christ, set off, in 563, with a band of twelve companions to preach the Gospel to the emigrant Scots. Crossing the seas in a currach of wickerwork covered with hides, Columba finally landed on the barren shores of Hi or Iona, a small island on the border-line between the kingdoms of the Scots and Picts. There he founded the famous monastery which was destined to become the centre of Christian missions in the north of Britain. There, after thirty years of arduous life, the call came. As Columba climbed for the last time the little hill above the monastery he lifted up his hands in blessing. "This place," he said, "is small and of no reputation; yet even the rulers of strange nations with their subjects shall confer great honours on it." During the brief watches of the night he gave

to his disciples his last message "to be at peace and have sincere love one to another." At daybreak he arose with the rest, and on his knees passed quickly away amidst a blaze of summer light (June 597). A week before his death, the baptism of the Kentish king Ethelbert, away down in the far south, marked the success of the Roman mission of Augustine.

From Hi the Irish monks carried the Gospel as far south as the Humber. Their organization, as usual, was monastic rather than episcopal, the various monasteries they founded all looking upon Iona as their head. In 635 their leader, Aidan, fixed his bishop-stool on the island-peninsular of Lindisfarne. From this monastery monks journeyed far and wide. For a few years the spell which Ireland cast over England, especially in the north, was almost irresistible. One Scoto-Irish monk, Dicul, made his way with five comrades to where the South Saxons still clung to their paganism, severed by the dense forests that clothed the Wealds from the forces that were redeeming the rest of England. Another, the son of a prince of Munster, established amongst the East Saxons the monastery, Fursey, the village of which still bears his name. A third Irish scholar, Maildulf, set up his hermitage and school in the midst of the forest that cut off the latest conquests of the West Saxons from the then borders of Welshland. His name is still preserved in the "Maildulf's burgh" (Malmesbury) which gathered round his monastery. It was also from the Irish mission-station of Old Melrose that Cuthbert, himself a peasant of the Lowlands, than whom no saint has left a deeper impression on the memory of the northern English, set off to pro-

claim the story of the Cross in the remoter villages of the Cheviots, as yet unreached in their heathenism.

What Columba did for Britain, the masterful and overbearing Columban attempted to do for Gaul; and for Columban as for Columba the final result was the same. Columban was born in Leinster in 543. At the age of forty he was inflamed with missionary zeal, and with twelve companions crossed over to Gaul (585). There, after several years of wandering, he built a monastery, first in a ruined Roman fort (Anagray) where oftentimes the monks had nothing to eat. But soon the numbers so grew that he was forced to build a larger monastery amid the extensive ruins of an old Roman town, Luxeuil in the Vosges, reduced by Attila to ashes, and overgrown by the jungle. There he organized a service where night and day the voices of the brethren "unwearied as those of the angels" arose in unending song.

As Columban maintained the Celtic usages against the Roman, the jealousy of the Frankish bishops was furnished with a suitable weapon of offense. But his enemies could have accomplished little had not Columban lost the favour of the royal house by his outspoken rebukes of the infamous queen-grandmother, Brunhild, and of what he called her "brothel-breed." So in 610 he was banished from Luxeuil, and after a vain attempt on the part of his enemies to ship him back from Nantes to Ireland, he wandered up the Rhine to Zug in Switzerland. Banished thence by the people for setting fire to one of their temples, Columban established himself at Bregenz. There we see him, assisted by St. Gall, with characteristic impetuosity, breaking the vats in

which the heathen brewed their beer for Woden, and throwing the gilded idols into Lake Constance. When driven thence by the fury of the priests, or by the revenge of Brunhild, his faith did not falter. "The God whom we serve," said he, "will lead us elsewhere." So Columban crossed the Alps and spent the last two years of his life in building his monastery of Bobbio in a gorge of the Appennines, near Genoa, and in writing tracts against the Lombard Arians. There he died and was buried (23d Nov. 615).

The labours of Columban were followed up by those of other evangelists. From their monastery of Luxeuil, the Irish missionaries spread everywhere. One of these, Dichuill, found his way through the forests of Burgundy to where now stands the town of Lure, the outgrowth of the cell that he first established. Not far away another monastery, under the modern form of St. Die, still preserves the name of this Irish saint. Another monk, Rupert, whether Irish by birth, or Frank of the royal house brought up under Columban, is uncertain, after settling for a while at Worms, struck across the Danube and established himself at Salzburg, while another Irishman, Kilian, crossed the Rhine to Wurzburg, and was there murdered with his two companions (July 689). Disen (+674) an Irish-abbot-bishop, after preaching for some time down the Rhine, settled near Mainz in a monastery that has given his name to the present town of Disemberg. No monastery of the Middle Ages was more noted than that of St. Gallen, in Switzerland, whose library still remains unsurpassed for the wealth of its Irish manuscripts. Its name commemorates an Irishman, the friend of

Columban, brought up in the same monastery of Bangor, who accompanied him to Luxeuil, and followed him, when driven out thence, to Zug and Bregenz. Before his preaching in the native dialects of Swabia, the spirits of flood and fell fled wailing up the mountains, crying, as with the voices of women, "Where shall we go? for he prays continually, and never sleeps." When in 612 Columban left Bregenz, Gall remained behind, for he was sick of a fever. On his recovery he commenced once again his missionary journeys in Swabia. One evening he arrived at the place where the torrent of the Steinach hollows for itself a bed in the rocks. As Gall was about to kneel in prayer, he was caught by a thorn bush, and fell. The deacon ran to his assistance. "No," said the saint; "here is my chosen habitation, here is my resting-place forever." So he arranged two hazel boughs in the form of a cross, passed the night in prayer, and began the next day to build a monastery, which in later times gave its name to a Swiss canton, and a great town.

Ireland indeed at that time, as one of its own chroniclers puts it, was "full of saints." But, unfortunately, the enthusiasm of these Celtic missionaries was not combined with equal resources of administration. Within a century of their establishment all but a few of the Irish monasteries had been driven to capitulate to Rome and to adopt the rival *Rule* of St. Benedict. In 818 Louis the Fair forced those which still clung to Celtic usages to fall into line with the others. The fate which thus attended Celtic monasticism in its missionary efforts abroad was followed by the disasters at home of the Viking

invasions. Plundering hordes of Norse and Danish heathen marked down the monasteries of Britain and Ireland as their prey, the more easily inasmuch as, especially in Ireland, the greater number lay within easy access from the coast. With untiring patience the monks again and again rebuilt their monasteries, only once more to see them destroyed by fire. When at length in 943 Christianity was once again nominally introduced into the Norse kingdom which the Vikings had established round Dublin, it was too late. The golden age of the Irish Church had passed away in an era of blood and fire. Her libraries had been burnt, her education ruined, and the cultured monks of the seventh and eighth centuries displaced by a clergy inferior both in ability and enthusiasm. Such monasteries as survived had become the centres of fierce tribal feud. The promise of the early morn had passed into the storm-clouds that have ever since overshadowed the "ancient land of saints and sages."

III

In the long struggle of Rome and Armagh the victory was won by Rome, a victory so complete that in later years the original St. Patrick, and the church he had founded, became lost in legends invented for her own purpose by Rome herself. Whatever may have been the influence of the Celtic Church it was Rome alone that in the long run reaped the harvest of credit and reward. Others may have toiled; she alone entered into their labours.

Into the story of the Roman missions it is needless

that we enter in any detail. It must suffice that we point out the main factors of her task and the results. In the first place we may note that the later strength of the mediæval papacy really rested upon the missionary activity of Rome. No abstract doctrine of the primacy of Peter would have established her spiritual supremacy had she not furnished in its support true soldiers of the Cross. Following the lead of Dean Milman historians are wont to speak of Gregory the Great as "the real father of the Mediæval Papacy." The title is indirectly a tribute to his missionary zeal, for the greatest of his works were his projects for the conversion of the heathen. Never, in fact, was the need for missions so great as in the three centuries which followed the death of this Pope. Gregory's enterprise came only just in time. If Christianity, humanly speaking, was to be saved, it could only be by persistent aggression. On every hand her dominion was threatened, her borders straightened. Only by the vigorous missionary enterprise of her sons could Christianity win a new empire in place of the kingdoms she had lost. Nor is it any discount from the gain of civilization to remember that in thus enlarging the borders of the Church Rome was also establishing her wider authority. Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, had perished; Constantinople was too much absorbed in her own defenses; of the ancient centres of Christianity Rome alone remained to wage war with both pagans and Muslim, and to gain as a reward new dominions for her spiritual Cæsars.

The story of Gregory's conversion of England is too well known to need repetition. We have already

noted the influence and share in this good work of the Celtic Church. In the upshot Rome appropriated to herself the labours of others. We cannot deplore the result. Alone of all the countries of the West, Ireland had formed no part of the Roman Empire. Her life, laws, and customs, thus still stagnated in the hopeless clan system from which the genius of the Empire might have saved her, as it did the Celts of France. Irish Christianity was without Rome's two great gifts of cohesion and law ; Celtic enthusiasm was more than balanced by Celtic anarchy. If Armagh had won, England would have suffered the fate which in after years befell Ireland. She would have been hopelessly cut off from those civilizing influences which contact with a wider and more organized world alone can give. The struggle of Rome with her Celtic rival was ended by the Synod of Whitby (664). The one side appealed to Columba, the other to St. Peter. "You own," cried King Oswiu, wearied with the interminable arguments, "that Christ gave to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; did He give any such power to Columba?" On hearing the reluctant "No," "Then," said Oswiu, "I will obey the porter of heaven, lest when I reach its gates he should shut them against me." The Irishmen, in disgust, sailed back to Iona, and the English Church, hitherto divided in allegiance and usage, was henceforth one within herself and in her obedience to Rome. The arrival as archbishop of Canterbury of the Greek monk Theodore of Tarsus (669) completed the conquest. He arranged her sees, brought to an end the free wanderings of her earlier bishops, made episcopal supervision a living thing,

and established national synods, whose annual meetings for consultation and direction showed lines of national unity and development that led in later days to one kingdom under one Council of the Wise. The unity of the Church in England, in fact, antedated by many centuries the unity of the realm. The triumph of Rome was complete when Theodore ordered the reconsecration of churches that had been blessed by other than her bishops, and the reordination of those admitted to orders by their hands.

Equally great in its results was the conquest by Christianity of unkempt Teutondom beyond the Rhine. Here again the first pioneers were Irish monks. Through her disordered and immoral condition the Gallic Church had done nothing for the conversion of her neighbour. This was left, as we have already seen, to the labours of the saintly Columban and Gall. But more lasting and important was the mission work of the English. No sooner had they received the Gospel themselves than they hastened to spread its knowledge in their native German forests. "Thus," in the enthusiastic words of Montalembert, "the Christianity of half the world has flowed, or will flow, from the fountain which first burst forth on English soil." The first of these apostles was Willibrord (+741), who by forty years of devotion assisted politically by the enterprises of Pippin of Heristal, the father of Charles Martel, won for the Church the Frisians round Utrecht, where he founded his see (736). Greater than he was a Devonshire man, Winfrith, the apostle of Thuringia, better known under his name of Boniface. Born, probably, at Crediton (680) of wealthy parents, and famous for

his learning, he lived until middle life in the Benedictine abbey of Nutsall, or Nursling, near Winchester. While engaged in teaching, there came to him the call to carry the Gospel to the land of his forbears. He went first to Frisia and worked with Willibrord, but was already planning a larger task. After his first fruitless effort to carry the Gospel to Germany he made his way to Rome to seek aid from Pope Gregory II. Armed with the Papal commission, and promising obedience to the Roman See, he then returned to his task (722). For five-and-thirty years we see him in labours more abundant and journeyings oft, now hewing down the sacred oak at Geismar amid the terror of the heathen; now struggling with the opposition of the Irish missionaries in Thuringia; preaching, baptizing, founding schools and monasteries, chief of which was the famous Fulda (744), and dividing into bishoprics his vast territory from the Rhine to the Elbe. In all this he was zealously aided by his English companions, while English ladies not a few crossed the Channel that they might share in the perils and joy of his missionary labours. Such was his success that in one year he is said, with characteristic mediæval exaggeration, to have baptized one hundred thousand converts. In 738 he was sent by Pope Gregory III to Bavaria, to bring that disorganized Church "into harmony with the traditions of the Roman See."

His work in Germany for the time being accomplished, Pope Zacharias in 744 appointed Boniface his vicar to take in hand the reform of the Church in Gaul. The condition of that Church,

which had hitherto maintained a certain independence of Rome, was deplorable. We have already noted the conversion of the Franks to the orthodox faith, under the lead of Clovis, and have marked the extraordinary political and ecclesiastical results of this baptism. Henceforth the Franks were nominally Christians, defenders of the orthodox faith ; in reality they were still heathen, no longer bound by the taboos and restraints of the heathenism they had discarded, and as yet uninfluenced by the ethics of Christianity. Painful centuries must necessarily elapse before Christianity could more than touch the surface of the lives of the many, or uproot the customs and superstitions of heathenism. Only slowly can a nation be cleansed of its devils ; they may be driven out with lash, but if the place be left empty they will return again, with new spirits, to their old habitation. The period of consolidation that follows all missionary enterprise is necessarily prolonged and painful. A later generation tends to forget the pit from which it was drawn, and the toil with which the task was accomplished.

In five great councils at which he presided Boniface with the assistance of Pippin and Carloman dealt firmly with these evils. At the same time he exacted from all "unity and obedience to Rome." He thus ruled the Church on both sides of the Rhine ; in Germany as metropolitan of Mainz, in France as the vicar of the Pope. In his seventy-fourth year Boniface abdicated his office. By a singular privilege granted to him by Pope Zacharias, he was allowed to choose his successor. He appointed Lullus, an Englishman from Malmesbury (753). Freed now

from official cares, he determined to devote the remnant of his days to the humble labours of a missionary, the perils of which he deemed nobler than the honours of his crosier. Murdered by the pagans of Friesland (June 5, 755), he thus obtained the fitting crown of his devoted service. The work begun by Boniface was completed by that great statesman, lawgiver, and conqueror, Charles the Great. With his sword he compelled the heathen Saxons to accept his rule and Christianity, while his genius for organization reduced realm and Church alike to order. Thus were the lands of Luther, Grotius, and Melancthon won for the Gospel. For the time being, also, in spite of the independence of Charles the Great, they were won for Rome. There is exaggeration in the statement that with Boniface "began the conquest of the episcopate by the Papacy," but, like other exaggerations, it witnesses to a truth. Boniface was the first missionary bishop in the realm of the Franks to take the oath of allegiance to Rome. One result of his work was to hand over the organization and control of the new German Church to the Papacy. It was through Boniface that, as Dollinger confesses, "the German Church excelled not only the French but all other Churches in submissiveness to Rome. At the Synod of Tribur (895) the German bishops declared 'The Roman Church is our master in church discipline; therefore let us patiently endure the yoke laid upon us, although it be scarcely tolerable.'" What the legions of Varus had failed to do was more than accomplished by the spiritual soldiers of the new Empire.

IV

We have referred to the devastations of the Vikings. Bishop Wordsworth has pointed out that the ravages and rapines of the Vikings were largely "the sure punishment" of the early neglect of Scandinavia by its Christian neighbours, especially the Franks, Angles and Irish.[1] Just as the neglect of Arabia by the Eastern Church permitted the upgrowth of the power of Islam, so the neglect of Christian duty and opportunity in Scandinavia led to the sufferings and destructions of the eighth and ninth centuries, when the Northmen swept all before them. Be this as it may this much is certain, that the terror of the Northmen did not cease until the aggression of the Vikings had been met by the counter aggression of the Church. Intrepid missionaries, with their lives in their hands, sought out the Arabs of the sea amid their own forests and fiords. The noblest of these was Anskar, well named the "Apostle of the North." Born (801) not far from the great monastery of Corbie near Amiens he grew up within its walls until transferred, about 825, to the northern colony of that house, called in consequence Corbey or Corvey, in Westphalia. His life was devoted to study and prayer. For him the heavens were ever open. One day, he tells us, he beheld the ranks of the angelic host, while from the midst of immeasurable light there came a voice, "Go and return to me again crowned with martyrdom." The opportunity came when in 826 a Danish prince, Harald Klak, desiring

[1] J. Wordsworth, "National Church of Sweden" (London, 1911), p. 30.

alliance with the emperor, Lewis the Pious, was baptized with his wife at Mainz. On Harald's return to Denmark he requested Anskar to accompany him. So with a single companion Anskar set off for Schleswig, ransomed a band of native youths out of slavery, and established a school. The school was a failure, and Anskar retired to a little port near Utrecht (Wyk te Duerstede) which carried on a large trade with Scandinavia. In 829 he crossed over to Sweden, where Christian slaves, carried off by the pirates, had spread some knowledge of the truth. After a perilous journey he arrived at Birka (Björkö), not far from Sigtuna (Upsala), the chief seat of the heathenism of the country, Anskar's real objective. Two years later (831) he returned to the Frankish court in order to report his progress to the emperor. Manifestly the opportunity had arisen for the carrying out of the old scheme of Charles the Great for the establishment of the Church in Northern Germany and in the regions beyond. So Anskar was consecrated the first archbishop of Hamburg, the place which had been selected as a convenient centre for the new missions. The next year he betook himself to Rome, promised allegiance to Gregory IV, received the pallium and ecclesiastical authority over the nations of the North.

Anskar returned to his work to find that the pirates had ravaged his see and burnt Hamburg, while his missionaries in Sweden had been expelled by the heathen (837). "The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord:" so saying the intrepid monk set to work to build up once more his annihilated labours. "Be assured," he

said to his heart-broken companions, "that what we have undertaken to do among these nations will not be lost, but will thrive more and more, until the name of the Lord extends to the uttermost bounds of the earth." Such faith deserved success. But seven years of further toil carried on by Gautbert, the first Swedish bishop, and a hermit called Ardgar, failed to gain the ear of the Swedes, though in Jutland the hostility of King Horic was disarmed. With increased funds, obtained by annexing the older see of Bremen (847), aided also by a timely nomination as imperial ambassador (*legatio*), he set off (848) for the court of King Olaf of Sweden. He arrived at a critical moment; tales were rife of the power of the "white Christ"; a growing scepticism was preparing the way for the overthrow of polytheism. So Olaf and his nobles determined that the toleration of the new faith should be allowed if confirmed by an appeal to the heathen gods. Lots were cast in the open air, after a ritual similar to that described by Tacitus. A bowl of blood with twigs in it was taken from the temple table, and the twigs invoked for the answer. Providence watched over this curious transaction, and, henceforth, in Sweden, after the further consent of the people had been obtained from an assembly in Upsala, there was an open door for the preaching of the Gospel. Before he died, Anskar saw the triumph of the Cross, not the less sure because it was slow. On 3d February, 865, this intrepid warrior of God passed to his reward. Disappointed in his long hope of dying a martyr, he welcomed as some compensation his severe bodily pains. "Have we not," he said, "received good from the hands of the Lord,

and shall we not receive evil?" He prayed much "for this one miracle, that out of him, by His grace, God would make a good man." His last words, repeated as long as he could speak, were these: "Lord, be merciful to me the sinner."

Anskar's last letter was a touching appeal to the German bishops not to slacken in their missionary labours. But in spite of the efforts of his successor and biographer Rimbert no progress was made in Sweden; while in Denmark the good work was almost destroyed by the violent reaction under Sweyn Forkbeard. In early life Sweyn had been baptized, along with his father Harald Blaatand, King of Denmark, as part of the conditions of peace dictated by the emperor Otho (965). But the influence of the great pirate settlement of Jombburg, where he was educated, proved too strong, and Sweyn relapsed into heathenism. He made war on his father, drove out the priests, and destroyed the churches. On the 3d February, 1014, the conqueror died at Gainsborough, after a campaign in which he had ravaged England, burning the churches, and violating the women. In his last hours he is said to have beheld the martyred king, Edmund of Bury, advancing towards him in full armour. Sweyn shouted for help, but the saint pierced him with his spear. Which things are an allegory; for his son, the great Cnut (1014–1035), with zeal stimulated by the crimes of his father, never rested until Denmark as a nation was won for Christ, largely by the help of missionaries whom, as Adam of Bremen tells us, "he brought from England." By his pilgrimage to Rome in 1027, Cnut, who had hitherto been looked upon by Christendom

at large as a heathen, brought his northern realms into union with Latin Christendom ; while his treaties with the masters of the Alpine passes secured safety for English and Danish pilgrims to the papal city. In spite of the cruelty and craftiness of his character, Cnut had done much, both by the temper of his laws and by his benefactions, to increase throughout his domains the influence of the Church. At the same time Olaf Skötronung, the first Christian king of Sweden (993–1021), busied himself with the conversion of his subjects, he also making much use for the purpose of English missionaries.

From England, also, had the Gospel first penetrated into Norway. Its introduction arose from the education at the court of Athelstan in England of Haakon the Good, the youngest son of Harald Fairhair. On his succession to the throne (934–961) Haakon quietly attempted to introduce Christianity into his country, but was compelled by public opinion to take part in heathen sacrifices. The attempt was renewed during the short reign of Olaf Tryggvason (995–1000), the hero of the Sagas, who, while travelling in Germany, had been baptized by a priest of Bremen. After his defeat of the English at Maldon Olaf and Sweyn had attacked London together (8th September, 994), but had been driven off by the stout defense of its citizens. Peace was made with Ethelred, and Olaf was confirmed at Andover (994) by Ælfheah, later known because of his martyrdom as St. Alphege of Canterbury. After his confirmation Olaf promised that he would never attack England again ; and on his return to Norway he tried hard to introduce Christianity, taking with him the priest of Bremen who had

first turned his thoughts to the Gospel. Olaf's defeat and death, when attacked by Sweyn, put an end to his plans. The forces of evil were too strong. After years of struggle, in which violence was the common refuge of both sides, little real good had been accomplished. At length Olaf the Holy (1017–1033) broke the foreign yoke of his country, hitherto the chief obstacle to the spread of the religion of its masters, demolished every stronghold of the pagans, and effected their conversion either by violence or by his English missionaries and their schools. Olaf's foundation of the mother church of Trondjhem was followed later by the organization of the country into sees, still nominally subject to the archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen. But only slowly during the next three centuries did this wild country soften down into Christianity; for its persuasion was rather of the sword than the Spirit. In Scandinavia "conversion demanded an extremely difficult change in life and habits, even when it did not penetrate very deeply into the character, especially among the men. A man had to give up the Viking life. He was forbidden to follow the old law of private vengeance, and to have more than one wife. The Church's rules as to marriage with near relations and others, as to penance, fasting, observance of holy days and Sundays, and in particular the prohibition to eat horse-flesh, were all burdensome." But the chief difficulty lay in the fact that "hitherto the laws had been of the people's own making. Now they had, in part at least, to be accepted from outside." [1]

Nothing is so remarkable in the history of the

[1] Wordsworth, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

Church as the way in which new converts at once seek to win others to the faith. The struggle in Norway was still in the balance when, in 996, Olaf Tryggvason sent the Gospel to Iceland. Within three years an Icelandic convert—Leif—set off as an apostle to Greenland. In the twelfth century the king of the Sveas, or Upper Sweden, afterwards honoured as St. Eric, was doing his best to Christianize Finland, by means of a missionary crusade conducted, however, with more humanity than the majority of such expeditions. Eric left behind him as bishop in Finland an Englishman called Henry who had come with Nicholas Breakspear—whom you will remember as the only Englishman who ever became a pope (Hadrian IV)—to the Swedish council of Linkoping. Some years later Henry perished as a martyr. Thus were the glad tidings carried from one country to another, and the wild men of the North brought within the fold of the Church. In Scandinavia, by the middle of the twelfth century, the public worship of Woden was dead, the cross everywhere triumphant.

V

Among the Slavs also the Gospel proved the power of God unto salvation. In Moravia the work was begun by two remarkable Greeks, natives of Salonika, a Greek town entirely surrounded by Slav people, Cyril, whose original name was Constantine (b. 827), and Methodius. They were both men of considerable experience. Cyril had been sent in 859 to labour among the pagan Chazars of the Crimea. There he discovered and brought back to Rome (861)

the remains of the martyr pope Clement I, while Methodius had taken some part in the conversion of the Bulgarians (860). In his work among this Turanian people—next to the Huns the most hated of the Asiatic invaders of Europe—he had used a method to reach their consciences not singular to his age. By his skill as a painter he represented the Last Judgment with such horror of the damned that Bogoris the king was literally frightened into baptism. In 863, Methodius and Cyril arrived in Moravia, whose king, Rastislav, had quarrelled with Rome, and leaned towards connecting his Church with that of the East, more, perhaps, because he would thereby cut himself off from German dependency than because of any theological prepossessions. But owing to the envoy of the metropolitan of Constantinople, Photius, Cyril accepted the invitation of Nicholas I and set off to Rome to seek recognition (867). There he died February 16, 869, and lies buried in the Church of St. Clement, in whose wonderful lower church is a fresco of his funeral with Nicholas I, who had died two years earlier, walking in the procession! Meanwhile Methodius (+885) returned to his labours in Pannonia and Moravia. The first labour of Cyril had been to invent an alphabet known as *glagolitic* for the yet unwritten Slavonic, and then render into the Slavonian tongue the New Testament and the Psalter. Half a century later it was superseded by the so-called Cyrillic alphabet, really invented by St. Clement of Drenoviza, on the basis of the *glagolitic*. A hundred years later, on the conversion of Vladimir (988), this version of Cyril, with its quaint Greek letters, was

at once adopted by the Greek teachers of Russia as the national Scriptures. But though Methodius had thus put himself under the jurisdiction of the Latins, he used to the end of his life the creed and ritual of the Greeks, nor would he abandon the reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular in spite of the opposition of the German bishops. John VIII, who had at first forbidden the service of God in a barbarous tongue, was convinced by his argument from the Psalms that God had made other languages than Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. He was possibly more influenced by the dread that the Moravians should attach themselves to Constantinople. A compromise was passed—in the mass the Gospel and Epistle were first read in Latin, and then translated into the language of the people.

The last years of Methodius were embittered by the attacks of his German fellow workers, who desired to reduce the Moravians into dependence on the see of Passau. Twice they branded Methodius as a heretic, and drove him to vindicate his faith and authority at the Lateran. As a result the church in Moravia was linked with the Bohemian. Its fate, however, was to be linked with Bohemia. There also the first seeds of the truth had been scattered in 871 by the active Methodius. The ensuing struggle with heathenism was long and severe, and was intensified by the Hun invasion of 908 which destroyed the Slavonic power and left German influences supreme. In 936 the saintly King Wenzel was murdered. During the eight years of his reign he had founded churches in every city of his realm, and shown forth a religion pure and undefiled, by visiting the fatherless and

widow in their affliction, redeeming the slave, and clothing the poor. His brother, Boleslav the Cruel, was at the head of the heathen conspirators, one of whose objects was to tear Bohemia away from dependence on the Empire. "God forgive thee, my brother," cried Wenzel, as they cut him down. But the years of heathen reaction could not stamp out the work which he had accomplished. Three years later Boleslav tried to atone for his murder by enshrining the bones of Wenzel at Prague. With Boleslav the Pious (967–999) there was the dawn of brighter days. The Bohemian Church was organized in the Latin form (983) under the learned Adalbert, the first bishop of Prague. His zeal against polygamy and the slave-trade stirred up the wrath of the heathen; while within the Church his Germanizing spirit, which had forbidden the Slavonic ritual, imported from Moravia, and substituted the Roman, led both parties to unite in his expulsion. But Rome had won; and in 1080 Hildebrand forbade all further use of the vulgar tongue. A few years later the monks who adhered to it were expelled and their service-books destroyed. But the national feeling, so strong among the Slavs, one side of which is the age-long hatred of Czech and German, could not be crushed. Three centuries later, Hus and Jerome found a country ripe for revolt. But the motive of their so-called Reformation as of recent Czech revolts against the Roman Church was as much nationalism as the Gospel. For the tragedy of Bohemia is that of a Slavonic race, surrounded by alien Germans, cut off from other Slavs by its religious dependence upon Rome. How different would have been its history as also the history of

Central Europe if Methodius, its apostle, had not been driven from the Eastern Church and subsequent connection with Russia by the heresy of Photius!

The conversion of the Poles presents few features of interest. This was accomplished through the coercion of its dukes (966). Here it is sufficient to mark that from the first it had a strong leaning to Rome, thus emphasizing in years to come the breach between the Polish and Russian branches of Slavdom. Under Casimir I (1034–1058), who was educated at the famous French monastery of Clugny, the Slavonic ritual was abolished, and Roman liturgies and customs introduced in its place. Here again, as in the case of Bohemia, we witness under forms of grievous wrong the tragedy of religion and race-instincts pulling different ways.

In one district of the North alone was the hold of paganism more lasting. We refer to the districts that now form the main centres of the Prussian Junkers. The savage Wends, who dwelt between the Elbe and the Oder, obstinately refused until the middle of the twelfth century to forsake their idols. Here the work was hindered for a reason, common elsewhere, but to which as yet we have not alluded. In all the missions we may detect the presence of political influences, and the evils of national strifes. Through political compulsion nations had been born into the Church in a day; to political causes also must be attributed, especially in Denmark and Norway, the strength of heathen reactions. The King of Denmark put his finger on the weakness as well as the strength of many of the Teutonic missionaries when he said that "they were accompanied by those whose mind was more

keen on the gathering of tribute than the conversion of the Gentiles." The Wends, like the Saxons in the days of the great Charles, ill brooked their subjection to the Holy Roman Empire. They looked on their missionaries as the allies of oppression. They considered that their ulterior purpose was to extend eastwards (*Drang nach Osten*) the domain of the marks or marches—the frontier lands of Teutondom—Brandenburg, Altmark, Neumark, Austria (Ocoterreich, *i. e.*, the Eastern realm) and the like. It was to little purpose that bishoprics and monasteries were founded with a centre at Magdeburg (967). At every opportunity these were destroyed by fire and sword. Equally fruitless were the efforts at a later date of Gottschalk their king, who had been brought up in a monastery and who, for fifteen years, laboured for the conversion of his people. In 1060 he and his missionaries were beaten to death with clubs, and sacrificed to their war-god Radegost. Their heads were then fixed on poles in the temple of Rethre. Not until 1133 did Albert the Bear, of the Altmark, who from 1144 onwards called himself Margrave of Brandenburg, beat down into a reluctant Christianity these dwellers round the modern Berlin. Their chief apostle was the saintly and indefatigable Vicelin (1125–1154). About the same time also Pomerania was compelled by its Polish overlords, the Duke of Poland, to accept Christianity which on its spiritual as distinct from its political side was chiefly the work of the gentle Otto of Bamberg.

A further step in the conversion of the Wends, especially in the Baltic provinces east of Berlin, was taken when in 1190 German democracy, under one

Walpot von Bassenheim, a trader of Bremen, stung by the enthusiasm of the crusades, established a union of ship captains from Lübeck for the succour of the sick and the dying at Acre in Palestine. In 1199 this was turned into the military order of the Teutonic Knights. "This Walpot," we read, "was not by birth a noble, but his deeds were noble." The new order obtained vast possessions in Germany. In 1227 it united with the order of the Brothers of the Sword who had compelled the Livonians to be baptized in a body, and in 1228 commenced a crusade against the heathen Prussians, who, since their massacre in 997 of St. Adalbert of Prague, had steadily resisted all attempts at conversion. Henceforth their history—to quote the summary of Carlyle—is "a dim nightmare of unintelligible marching and fighting," but the results at any rate are luminous still. In a fifty years' war they subdued the pagans by the argument of the sword, and laid the foundations of modern Prussia. We may note that the Gospel and the Sword went hand in hand, and to this we owe the foundation in 1201 of the German trading city of Riga, now the great Baltic port of Russia. In 1255 Riga was made the metropolis of the Prussian and Livonian Church. This was followed in 1256 by the foundation of Konigsberg, where in later years the kings of Prussia should be crowned, and in 1276 of the great castle of Marienburg, henceforth the centre of the Teutonic Order. The modern history of Prussia, and of Europe to-day, is only rightly appreciated when we thus grasp the savage origins of Prussian Christianity, and the recent development of all her culture.

Even in Eastern Europe the enthusiasm of her missionaries won for Rome a province that, geographically, should have fallen to the see of Constantinople. From the close of the ninth century until Otto the Great, by his victory at Lechfeld (955), shut them up within their present boundaries, the Magyars were the terror of Europe. They swept over the West like a stream of fire, uttering cries that none could understand, and massacring the Christians by thousands, especially in Bavaria, which suffered frightfully from their ravages. Their slaves were countless; through them, also, the glad tidings was first carried to their masters. The work thus strangely begun by the ravages of war was furthered by the toils of German missionaries, the forerunner being a certain Wolfgang, a monk from Einsiedeln in Switzerland, centuries later the home of the reformer Zwingli. Wolfgang was followed by the vigorous Adalbert of Prague and the work was completed by Stephen, their first king (997–1038), who had married the Christian princess, Gisela of Bavaria. To him it was given to found alike both Church and State. From the first he drew close to Rome, from whose pope, Sylvester II, he had received his title (1000). Again we note that the persuasion of the people was not of the spirit. Every ten villages were forced to build and endow a church; whoever would not become a Christian was degraded into a serf. Thus again a race of Tartars, whom the legions of the Cæsars had never conquered, recognized the spiritual dominion of Rome, while hordes of grim warriors, so long the terror of the Church, became in the coming centuries the bulwark of Europe against the advance of the Turks.

The standing reproach cast by the Latin Church in the teeth of her sister of the East is her barrenness; that Constantinople and its dependencies can show no missionary operations comparable to those we have already examined, and others that in every age have emanated from Rome and its subject Churches. The reproach is true, though its cause lies deep in the mysteries of human nature itself. The Eastern Church, like the brooding East, has ever been stationary and immutable. Though it would be flattery to say that it has "plunged in thought again," nevertheless its title of Orthodox reveals its ideal; on the other hand the Western Church, like the West, is aggressive, flexible, and comprehensive or Catholic. It is characteristic of the East that for centuries, in the Church of Alexandria, the dead hand of its first bishop St. Mark was employed as the instrument of consecration. It is characteristic of the West that the Latin Church, entering on her career amid the crash of a falling empire and the wild chaos of barbarian hordes, should realize that for her the method of salvation lay in a constant aggression, controlled and organized by a new imperialism, or rather the old imperialism under a more spiritual form.

One great difference between the Eastern and Western Churches should be noted. In the East there is no period that can be called Mediæval. For centuries, until the fall of Constantinople, the Eastern Church was Greek in name and character, conserving the old spirit, usages and rites almost without change. Nothing in fact in history is more remarkable than the vitality of the Eastern portion of the Roman

Empire, its repeated emergence after defeat and disaster, and the unchanging civilization which so long centred itself in Constantinople. No doubt the Eastern Church had its struggles and difficulties, but they were wholly different from those of the West. In the West it was the struggle of assimilation of discordant elements—much the same problem in the spiritual sphere as that of America to-day in the political. In the East it was the repulse of an alien religion. The work of the Greeks in the salvation of Europe has been well described by the great statesman William Gladstone who through life loved their nation and pleaded their cause:

> "It was those nations who broke the force of the advancing deluge, and left of the deluge only so much as the rest of Europe was able to repel. They were like a shelving beach which restrained the ocean. That beach, it is true, is beaten by the waves, it is laid desolate, it produces nothing; it becomes nothing, perhaps, but a mass of shingle, of rock, of almost useless seaweed; but it is a fence behind which the cultivated earth can spread, and escape the incoming tide; and so it was against the Turk—the resistance of Bulgarians, of Servians, of Greeks, a resistance in which one by one they succumbed."

The student even of liberal culture fails to realize the tremendous debt which the common Christianity of Europe owes to this resistance of the Eastern Church to the Islam conquerors. Had Constantinople fallen to the Turks four centuries earlier than it did it is difficult to see how the Christianity of the West could have been saved from the fate which overwhelmed the East. To this resistance also we

owe that unchangeableness in the Eastern Church which has saved it from all the follies and also all the glories of mediævalism. For the problems of resistance and assimilation are utterly different. The one demands conservation and conservatism, the other constant growth. We may reproach the Eastern Church for its unprogressive character; but if so our reproach should be with understanding of the great part which "unprogressiveness" often plays in the development of civilization.

To this fact of the different problems that the Eastern and Western Churches had to solve we may also trace the tremendous catastrophe of their separation. To-day these sister churches stand aloof

> Like cliffs, which had been rent asunder
> A dreary sea now flows between.

The shallow historian is accustomed to sneer at the causes of their separation, to speak of the addition of a word in a creed (*filioque*) and the like. As a matter of fact the separation, though its ostensible causes were trivial, was almost inevitable, and was the direct result of the different experiences through which each had passed. No church which had passed through the tremendous crises, which to-day we sum up in the phrase the Middle Ages, but would fail to understand the special characteristics which the age-long resistance of Constantinople to Islam, as well as her Greek origins, was impressing upon her. In the West, by her necessary development, the Church was led to claim a position of equality with, if not superiority to, the State. In the East, on the

contrary, from causes just as political and inevitable as those in the West, the whole drift was towards an identification of Church and State that was in due time to pass into subordination. In the West the conception of nationalism has slowly shed the conception of inevitable uniformity of creed and religion; nationalism is a matter of race, boundaries, or political associations. In the East from time immemorial nationalism and religion have ever been one, *i. e.*, in ultimate issues political events are determined not by national boundaries or race affinities but by common religious instincts. As we see in India to-day where there is no common religion there can be no common nation. On the other hand Islam binds together Albanian, Turk, Arab and Afghan.

In the one great addition to the Greek Church, the conversion of the Russians, we see almost completely this identification of nationalism and religion. Russia is the only country of Europe Christianized by the sole command of its prince, though not without some previous efforts on the part of Greek missionaries. In place of Augustine of England, Patrick of Ireland, and Boniface of Germany, we have its Tsar; Vladimir Isapostolos, "Vladimir equal to an apostle," Vladimir, the prince of Kiev and Novgorod, of the Norse house of Rurik, who through the influence of his mother Olga determined not only to adopt Christianity himself, but to make it the State religion for his people (988). An elaborate tale is told of the reasons which led to his choice of the Greek Church. Vladimir in making his decision may have been impressed by the gorgeous ceremonies of Santa Sophia; he was probably more convinced by the complete

identification of Church and State. So he issued his decree that all Kiev should flock to the Dnieper to receive baptism, "and whosoever on the morrow should not repair to the river, whether rich or poor, he would hold him for an enemy!" In the West the Pope rose to imperial supremacy because men turned in despair from a world of warring kings and princelets to the one independent power that stood for righteousness. In Russia where men faced for centuries the overwhelming peril of the Tartar hordes, everything depended upon the strength of the Crown; thus autocracy after a brief trial of national patriarchs with the rights of the former patriarchs of Constantinople strictly subordinated the spiritual power to the secular, or rather, invested both in one supreme head, the Tsar. Any other course would have led to the destruction of the nation in her fight with her enemies. If Russia had come under the sway of Rome, it is possible that she would have passed through a similar historical evolution to the Tartar Hungarians or the Slavs of Bohemia and Moravia. Possibly the political results might also have been similar; the Empire of Russia might never have emerged from her Tartar dependence. But here we verge upon speculations which would carry us far beyond the limits of the mediæval Church and its great missionary efforts.

We must bring this hurried survey to a close. In Western Europe the victory of the Cross over the heathen was complete. But in the East the future of the Muslim, and the recovery by the Church of the conquests of the crescent is still a problem of the future. The method of that recovery and its times

knoweth no man; whether by some gigantic struggle of the eagles over the carcass, or by the peaceful and enlightened methods of the missionary. But its certainty is the comfort of every believer. In the words of one of your own poets we may say

> Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,
> The eternal years of God are hers;
> But Error wounded writhes in pain,
> And dies amid her worshippers.

"On the bronze gates of St. Sophia at Constantinople may still be seen—at least it might be seen some years ago—the words placed there by its Christian builder, and left there by the scornful ignorance or indifference of the Ottomans—I. X. NIKA, Jesus Christ conquers. It is the expression of that unshaken assurance, which in the lowest depths of humiliation has never left the Christian races of the East, that sooner or later theirs is the winning cause."[1]

[1] Church, "Influence of Christianity Upon National Character."

LECTURE III

THE IDEALS AND ANTAGONISTIC FORCES OF THE MIDDLE AGES

LECTURE III

THE IDEALS AND ANTAGONISTIC FORCES OF THE MIDDLE AGES

I

IN the last lecture we dealt with the task of the Church in reclaiming the heathen for the Cross. We surveyed in hurried outline the great missionary campaigns of early mediæval Europe. We noted the missions of the Eastern Church, but saw that from the standpoint of the historian of the Middle Ages they stand really outside his scheme, inasmuch as in Russia and the East there is no period that can strictly be called mediæval. The Middle Age of Russia, its struggle with the Tartars, came at a time when in the rest of Europe the Middle Ages with their characteristic development was dying out. Hitherto we have confined our attention to the external side of these heroic enterprises. We have looked solely at their extension, the provinces and kingdoms won for the Church. In our present lecture we propose to look at their intension, to discover the causes of the Church's power as a civilizing factor, then to pass to an analysis of the effects of the mission efforts upon the social and ethical development of the people.

At the very outset of our investigation it may be well to meet an objection and point a conclusion. These wholesale conversions, it may be urged, were

but nominal, formal and external, as we have already noted in the case of the Franks. In its conflict with the barbarians Christianity had conquered; yet at times it might seem as if the chief result were to make barbarism more superstitious, and cruelty more ingenious. The new faith scarcely cleansed the outside of the cup and platter; within, it was as of old, full of extortion and excess. An adversary might argue that the only elements of Christianity which the barbarians made their own were its rites, magic, miracles, above all the belief in the supernatural assistance of its saints. All this is true and more. Nevertheless, it is one of those half-truths which are more false than any lie. Let us hear in this matter the wise words of Sir James Stephen: "Where is that country and what is that time in which Christianity has been more than this amongst the great multitude of those who have called and professed themselves Christians? The travellers in the narrow way, who are guided by her vital spirit, have ever been the 'chosen few.' The travellers along the broad way, wearing her exterior and visible badges, have ever been the 'many called.' And yet he who should induce any heathen people to adopt the mere ceremonial of the Church, to celebrate her ritual, and to recognize, though but in words, the authority of her Divine Head, would confer on them a blessing exceeding all which mere human philanthropy has ever accomplished or designed. For such is the vivifying influence of the spirit of the Gospel that it can never be long otherwise than prolific of the highest temporal benefits to all, and of the highest spiritual benefit to some in every land which acknowledges

it as a rule of life, and receives it as a system of worship."[1]

To the same effect also is the verdict of a modern thinker: "Christianity," says Ritter, in his "History of Christian Philosophy," "offered itself and was accepted by the German tribes as a law and as a discipline, as an ineffable, incomprehensible mystery. Its fruits were righteousness and works, and belief in the dead word. But in a barbarous people this is an immense advance, an inestimable benefit. Ritual observance is a taming, humiliating process; it is submission to law; it is the acknowledgment of spiritual inferiority; it implies self-subjection, self-conquest, self-sacrifice. It is not religion in its highest sense, but it is the preparation for it." However external or superstitious the rites of the new faith they could not fail to impart in some way the sense of human sinfulness, and this, after all, is the basal fact in human progress. Even superstitions and crude beliefs, which to-day we reject, deepened the conviction that crime brought divine vengeance. But this consciousness of responsibility to God, after all, is the sole foundation of political amelioration. A thousand times better the most superstitious tribe that believes that beyond itself and higher than itself is God's moral government and retribution, however imperfect may be this conception, than the most cultured realm which believes that there is no moral authority higher than the State. Moreover we must remember that there is an evolution in the world of religion as there is an evolution in the world of na-

[1] "The Founders of Jesuitism," in Stephen's "Collected Essays," p. 130.

ture. "When I was a child I thought as a child" is a truth that applies with the widest sweep. The stages of growth in the religious life of nations and individuals are ever the same—"first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear;" but before all this there must be the casting of the seed in the earth.

Another result of this nominal and rudimentary conversion must not be overlooked. Its very superficiality rendered easy the supremacy of Rome. Superstition is ever the characteristic of the heathen; conversion and civilization but slowly destroy its hold. Upon its follies and terror, as well as upon reverence and awe, Rome securely founded her vast system of sacerdotal privilege and pretension. It was superstition that added lightning to her spiritual thunders; it was this that made men invest the actions of the saints, and the possession of their relics, with the constant recurrence of the miraculous. Moreover if the Church influenced the barbarian, the barbarian was not without his reaction on the Church. We see this in the growth in the ritual of the Church of materialized superstitions. If these, to the modern mind, seem to differ but slightly from the grossest idolatries, we must remember the wilder practices and beliefs from which the heathen were weaned. We have an illustration in the "Dialogues" which Gregory the Great sent to the Bavarian princess, Theolinda. The excuse for the wild legends with which they are filled is not only that Gregory as well as his readers profoundly believed them; he succeeded by their means in weaning the Arian Lombards to the true faith.

Thus the history of Latin Christianity is the demonstration that childishness, as well as wisdom, is justified by her children. Rome grew because she was, in fact, as the modern biologist would phrase it, both in creed, organization, and ritual perfectly adapted to an imperfect environment. She ruled the age because she represented in herself its weakness as well as its strength. Unlike the early Church she took refuge in a policy of syncretism or accommodation. A premature Protestantism, with its spiritual methods, its independence of material aids, its appeal to the individual intellect and conscience, would have been the flinging of pearls before swine. Protestantism is, in fact, the triumph of the individual, conscious of his supreme value and his direct relation to God. In Protestantism, as in the theology and ethics of St. Paul, the individual becomes a law unto himself because he has become conscious of the unity of that self with a higher self. But we must not forget that a St. Paul is both inexplicable and impossible unless we remember the discipline of the Judaism which preceded him. So also with Protestantism and Romanism. To the thoughtful historian they are not so much opposed systems of truth as different stages of development. Romanism tends to merge the individual in the organized society ; her way to the kingdom is rather through obedience than through the development by the individual of his full powers. But every thoughtful man will own that in the nursery, whether of the world or the home, obedience to organized authority must come first ; only through such obedience, mechanical even and formal, will the child or the nation attain, in the fullness of times,

to the higher growths of intellect and soul, to that obedience which comes from the inner constraint of conscience, and to that freedom which is the following out with gladness the unhindered development of one's highest self as well as the complete recognition of the claims of the larger whole of which the individual is but a part.

So important, in our judgment, is this line of argument, especially for the historian surveying with philosophic and yet reverend mind the progress of humanity, that we would linger upon it. We would claim that our debt to the mediæval Church must not be measured only by such ethical results, much less by the means of their attainment, as commend themselves to the twentieth century. The reader too often forgets the evolution, slow and painful, of society and morals, and in consequence neglects, in reading history, to look at progress from the standpoint of that which was attainable in the age in question. When thus considered relatively, forces and tendencies which to-day we should condemn as mischievous, are seen to have been, at their time and for their purpose, potent for good; though the good was not unmixed with evil, and was often pregnant with coming catastrophe. We may illustrate by the mediæval doctrine of penitence, especially the corollaries of this mediæval doctrine, the system of indulgences and the penitentials. As regards indulgences—the great abuse of the system,—the chief errors sprang up in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, largely as an outcome of the Crusades. The penitentials and their effects were of an earlier age. This great instrument for Christianizing barbarian tempers, the doctrinal basis

of which may be found in the acts and teaching of Ambrose, was probably the creation of the Irish Church and, in special, of Columban. Thence through the great English archbishop, Theodore of Tarsus, the penitentials passed into general use in the Church of the West. An attempt at codification of the different systems in vogue formed part of the reforms of Charles the Great; their use was one of the forces on which he relied for reducing his empire to order. In due time the older penitentials gave place to the scholastic sacrament of penance, and were forgotten.

In condemnation of the principles and methods of the whole system historians are nowadays substantially agreed. As Dr. Plummer truly remarks in his Introduction to his classic edition of Bede's "Historia Ecclesiæ," "The penitential literature is in truth a deplorable feature of the mediæval Church. Evil deeds, the imagination of which may perhaps have dimly floated through our minds in our darkest moments, are here translated and reduced to system. It is hard to see how any one could busy himself with such literature and not be the worse for it." And yet such a view, though perfectly correct, may be an instance of the difficulty of thinking historically. For the student should never forget the great law illustrated on every page of ecclesiastical history, "that those beliefs or institutions which seem irrational or absurd, or unworthy of the Christian spirit, have come into vogue in order to kill some deeper evil, not otherwise to have been destroyed." [1] The penitentials were a necessity if the Church was to bring

[1] Allen, "Christian Institutions," p. 408.

the masses that had nominally passed into the kingdom of Christ yet remained in many respects heathen in heart and practice, into a working acquaintance with the elementary laws of decency and hygiene, let alone into any real experience of religion. They were a rough method of enforcing obedience to moral law upon a rough people, and of holding down the usages and reminiscences of heathenism. In the mediæval Church, unlike the Church of the first four centuries, baptism came first, oftentimes the baptism of whole races received as they were into the Church of the Empire which they had conquered; training and discipline must needs follow. The catechumen work, which had once been preparatory to admission into the Church, had now to be done for those who were already nominally Christians, and who, intellectually and morally, were much less able to understand it.

Penance, to adopt for this system of discipline the familiar title nowadays somewhat restricted in its application, was thus no mere creation of a greedy sacerdotalism, but a response to popular needs, the outcome of the revolution produced by the barbarian invasions. In the world in transition no state save the Church was either strong enough or civilized enough to enforce obedience to moral law, or hold down the usages and reminiscences of heathenism. In her capacity as the guardian of conduct and morals the Church's punishments were at first limited to those sanctioned by the pains or fears of the wounded conscience. Unfortunately the Church soon yielded to the Teutonic custom of commuting misdeeds by a money payment, or by means of substitutes. Hence the opening of the door to the abuse

of indulgences. In the earlier age the chief defect of the system lay in the fact that punishment bore more hardly on the poor than on the rich, while above all it made sin something arbitrary and external to the soul. The priest also who could release from the punishments of the Church on earth, or whose prayers had power with God in the mysterious other world of retribution, took the place of the Christ who could purify the heart. Thus the pope and not the Holy Spirit became the administrator of mercy and pardon. The human race became afraid of dealing directly with God, and sacerdotalism won its long triumph.

The other evils of the system of penance have been often exposed, and are sufficiently familiar. On its theoretical side it was a complicated system that needed a trained intelligence to understand or explain, upon some details of which Roman theologians were always sharply divided. As usually happens with such a system it was speedily perverted by the people. The student of ethics will point out the tendency, always natural to the Roman spirit, to stiffen all morality into legal restrictions, and to confound the inner law with the regulations of the Church. Or he may dwell on the worst effects of the system as seen in the development of the penance of flagellation and the sudden apparition in the middle of the thirteenth century of the Flagellants. Of the former the classic example is St. Elizabeth of Thuringia (+1231), a woman of the rarest self-abnegation and spiritual aspirations, whom the fanaticism of Conrad of Marburg sought to break into perfect obedience by constant scourging, stripped

to her shift. He may instance the madness of that typical hermit of the eleventh century, Dominicus Loricatus, who with a broom in each hand and singing psalms, could wipe off, as his friend, Peter Damiani, relates with pride, a century of guilt within a week. In the outbreak of the Flagellants (1259), this rude form of penance became a dangerous, contagious disease. Tens of thousands of all ranks and ages in the cities of Northern Italy walked in solemn procession, scourging themselves until the blood ran. Thence the movement spread to the Rhinelands and Germany, but disappeared as rapidly as it had arisen. A century later, as the result of the Black Death, Europe was again covered with bands of Flagellants, stripped to the waist, scourging themselves with thongs knotted with iron spikes. They believed that this torture, continued for thirty-three days and a half, would deliver the soul from all taint of sin. The theologian, finally, in condemnation of the system will point to the constant haggling and bargaining over the degree of sin and the value of merit, or he may relate the numberless instances of desperate abuse, a chicken or a pint of wine purchasing absolution for the foulest deeds.

These evils should not be minimized ; nor should their exaggeration obscure the real inwardness to the mediæval mind of the doctrine and its corollaries. As Harnack allows, its first effect was the deepening of the sense of sin, though the deepening was counterbalanced in time by the stupefying readiness with which men confessed that they were sinners. Through the doctrine of penance men learned that love and suffering are one. Another effect was the

formation side by side with the sacramental Christ of the image of the historical Jesus, in the contemplation of whose sufferings Bernard and others found their most passionate exaltation. In the doctrine, first suggested by the English doctor Alexander of Hales, and developed by Thomas Aquinas, of the common treasury of merit out of whose inexhaustible store the pope could dispense to the spiritually destitute, we see another instance of the dominant mediæval conception of solidarity so unintelligible to nineteenth century individualism. In everything the social aim predominates; the duties of life spring out of our unity as a race; humanity on earth is one in its sufferings with humanity in the invisible world. All this formed part of the education of the race for better things to come.

II

By a natural transition we pass from the study of the penitentials, as an illustration of the nature of mediæval conventions, to the consideration of another matter, the right understanding of which lies at the root of insight into all mediæval matters. We allude to the discrepancy in mediæval life between its ethical and spiritual ideals and the spotted actualities of its daily life. Practice, it is true, in every age must always drop below the ethical standard, unless indeed the ethical standard is of a low average. Certainly Christian practice, save for the saint, can never attain the ideal as it is in the great Exemplar. Even in Greece and Rome we see the contrast of practice and precept. But in neither Greece nor Rome could there exist the abysmal con-

tradictions which we find abound in mediæval Christianity.

The reason, of course, is obvious. The ethical standard of Greece and Rome were finite and human. They were the results of the introspective thoughts of its philosophers, and could not rise higher than their own source. But the Christian ideal of conduct involved the supernatural and infinite; the source and example was the perfection of the one Divine Life on earth. With the Greek time was of the essence of the ideal; the ancient demanded a standard that could be fulfilled on earth. With the Christian the ideal was from the first brought into relation with the great Beyond; the will of God as it is done in heaven is the daily rule for men's will on earth. With the Greek or Roman,—for instance, the noblest stoic of them all, Marcus Aurelius,—ethics were limited to present-day duty; the other world had no message of hope. With the Christian this life was but the schoolhouse. For him, as for Browning's grammarian,

> "Actual life comes next.
> Man has Forever."

He sums up its possibilities both for the now and the hereafter in the golden thought: "Beloved now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be. But we know that when it shall be made manifest we shall be like him."

Contradiction therefore between the ideal and the actual in Christianity was sharp and inevitable, and only could have been avoided by a Christianity that came down to the level of human nature itself. The

gospel of salvation was necessarily, both for the individual and the race, a gospel of contradiction between the ideal upheld and life's common cravings and passions. Such contrast every man feels within his own heart; and this law of the microcosm has ever been the law of the world at large. But never has the contradiction between the ideal and the actual been more vivid than in the Middle Ages. And this for a double reason. The contradiction would have been less sharp and painful had the ideal been lowered, or had human nature been worthier. But, to the eternal glory of the mediæval Church, whatever its practice, it never lowered its standard. On the contrary, the very simplicity of an age that knew nothing of introspection or higher criticism gave to the ideal a literal sharpness of outline, inexplicable to a more complex generation. Nevertheless this literalness produced such mighty saints as St. Bernard, St. Francis, or St. Catherine of Siena. The mediæval saint, in fact, towers above all other saints, simply because he knew nothing of twentieth century adaptations of the Gospel to the need of business, pleasure, knowledge, politics, and imperialism. But while the mediæval saint thus set before himself an ideal far more difficult and transcendent than those in vogue to-day, on the other hand the ethical capacities of the average mediæval man were far lower than those of to-day. For it is the weakness of the twentieth century, as well as its strength, that between the ethics of the street and the pew there is not an overwhelming difference. In the twentieth century, therefore, we are not troubled by the glaring contradictions between ideal and practice; if

anything it is the ideal that needs raising ; it is too much smirched with the dust of what is deemed practicable. But in the Middle Ages the average man was but a savage once removed, the long centuries of whose superstition and vicious practices could not be eradicated by a few years of sacraments and teaching. The student, therefore, will make but little progress in the understanding of the early mediæval Church who does not sympathetically bear in mind the inevitable contradiction between the ideals, sublime beyond measure, of the saint, and the pit, noisesome, dark and barbarous, from which the actual life of men was digged. Religion, in fact, was reverenced as a thing external, the special concern of a priestly class whose merits the community vicariously shared. The application of inward religion by the laymen to the round of life in the castle, in the camp, in the shop or in the field, was an ideal of whose realization the Church only slowly began to dream. Not until St. Francis founded his order of Tertiaries do we find it taken up in any organized form.

Another matter should be noted. To the twentieth century contradiction between ideal and practice is a difficulty which for the mediæval mind does not seem to have existed. The Middle Ages sought, of course, to reconcile belief and practice, but their failure led neither to subtle questionings nor rebellion. The more deeply they outraged the one, the more tenaciously they clung to the other. This was not wholly the homage paid by vice to virtue but was partly due to the consciousness of solidarity. Laxity of practice was the concern of the individual. It might involve the loss of his soul ; but laxity of belief or in ideal

meant the downfall of the social structure. So in an age when an individual did not recognize himself save in so far as he formed part of State or Church, the theories and ideals of social and ecclesiastical economy were everything, the facts of private life of little moment. Men were saved both in this world and in the life to come by their fitting in with the whole through correctness of dogma and doctrine. It were the easiest of tasks to find illustrations of vice that would have brought a blush to the pagans of Rome, yet coupled with an astonishing religious scrupulosity. Ferocious and sensual, the Middle Ages worshipped humility and asceticism. There has never been a purer ideal of love than in the romances of its chivalry, as purified by Walter de Map and others, nor a grosser profligacy of life.

Of the illogicalness of the age there is, perhaps, no greater illustration than the extraordinary case of Honorius. The fact that in 680 the sixth Ecumenical Council publicly anathematized this pope for monotheistic heresies formed no bar to papal claims of infallibility. When facts would not square with doctrine, then so much the worse for the facts. The very recollection of the circumstance undoubtedly faded away in the eighth century, until revived by the controversialists of the sixteenth. But the whole history of the papacy supplies similar contradictions. Let the student, for instance, turn over the annals of Rome in the tenth and early eleventh centuries. For Europe at large the pope was the vicar of God. Mighty kings, Cnut among them, journeyed from afar that they might receive his blessing. He dwelt in an Eden of beauty where the gates of heaven were

never shut. His spiritual thunders were more potent than legions of armed warriors. But as an actual fact in Rome herself for a couple of centuries the pope was the sport of faction, raised, deposed, reverenced or murdered, according to the varying mood and largesse of the hour. At the commencement of the tenth century in eight years several popes were elected and overthrown. The greatest of all the popes, Hildebrand, who claimed that he "alone held the keys of heaven and hell, alone was able to bind and loose on earth as in heaven, to give and to take away according to the merits of each man, empires, kingdoms, marquisites, duchies, countships and the possessions of all men," who made the papacy the dominant force in the system of the Middle Ages, died in exile, driven away from his own city.

In the same spirit men treated the Holy Roman Empire—pope and emperor were supposed to be like the Siamese twins, two and yet one. Severance between the two was impossible; they must work together for the one common good of the one common flock. They were the sun and moon which lightened the world's darkness. But this complete accord of the papal and imperial powers, as Dr. Bryce points out, was never attained but three times in the history of the centuries: in the time of Charles the Great and Leo; under Otto III and his two popes, Gregory V and Sylvester II; thirdly under Henry III; certainly never thenceforth. At all times pope and emperor were seeking to subordinate the other to himself; the pope declaring that he made the emperor as the vicar of God and that the temporal power was his gift; the emperors seeking to get the election of popes into

their own hands and to subordinate the spiritual to the civil authority. This battle of the two forms the centre round which revolves the churchmanship and politics of the Middle Ages, especially in Italy and Germany. But the battle could never have arisen had it not been for the extraordinary influence upon the mediæval mind of ideas and ideals, and its equally extraordinary capacity to overlook discrepancy.

The illustrations of the essential contradictoriness of the Middle Ages are endless. The contrast between its ideal and practice is the cause of its endless attempts at reform, and the secret of the extraordinary fascination of mediæval history in general. In mediæval Christianity there is no dull, drab plain of featureless, logical uniformity that the historian traverses with respect but fatigue; peaks tower into the clear blue with bewildering abruptness from pestilential swamps. Take Monasticism, for instance; to the mediæval mind the highest possible mode of Christian living. Its story, as we shall see more fully in a later lecture, is a long record of alternate swamp and mountain top; of an ideal so transcendent that men inevitably fell away, until some new reformer once more restored the lost vision. But the constant, glaring contrasts between the ideals and the actualities of monastic life never caused the mediæval mind to question the worth of the ideal itself.

III

We should do well to inquire what it was in the life and thought of the mediæval Church, apart from

its undoubted spiritual power, that especially made for civilization in its relations with the rough material left by the barbarian conquests. One word of caution is advisable at the outset. In our discussion we shall deal with the matter in an abstract fashion, examining the forces and processes of society much as the anatomist examines an organism or bodily framework. From such examination much may be learned. But we must never forget that more important far than organic framework is the life of which this frame is but the outer shell. And it was neither the logic of its theology, the strength of its organizations, the fascination of its religious rites, nor even its multitudinous charities and social activities, but the life of Christ manifesting itself abundantly in the mediæval Church—poor, incomplete, inconsistent, as may at times have been its expression—that saved the world from the deluge of barbarism and restored civilization. For, in spite of all shortcomings, there has never been a time when the Church has forgotten its divine mission as the representative of Him who came not to be ministered unto but to minister. Even in the dreariest days God has not left Himself without His witnesses; men and women not a few, whose lives, made radiant by the Cross, have filled with light the darkest places. In every age, even in those in which the life of the Church has seemed at its lowest, the greatest force that has made for civilization and uplifting has been the continued vitality of the great principles of the Gospel; its insistence, in season and out of season, upon self-sacrifice and renunciation; its abounding altruism; the value given to the poorest and meanest as the brother for whom

Christ died ; the stress laid upon sin as the blot on human life, the hindrance to further progress, the cause of inevitable retribution ; the revolution effected by the teaching of a future life, the bringing in of a new world to redress the balance of the old, with its doctrine of judgment and consequent rewards and punishments.

In our enumeration of the factors in Christianity that have made for the regeneration of mankind we must not overlook its optimism. The crude doctrine of total depravity enunciated by St. Augustine has never succeeded in banishing, in practice, the belief of the Church that the latent powers which make for righteousness exceed those which are evil ; that even in the far country man is not far from the kingdom of God ; and that human nature, on the whole, is on the side of the angels. The great uplifting forces of humanity have always manifested this abounding optimism, and have demonstrated that Pessimism is of the evil one. Illustrations abound, but nowhere is this radiant optimism more conspicuous than in the Franciscan revival. Brother Ruffino, of whom we are told that "whether asleep or awake his mind was always with the Lord," narrates that when he saw the Saviour His sign to him was this : "As long as thou shalt live thou shalt no more feel sadness nor melancholy : he that made thee sad was the devil." In the optimism of Calvary the friars everywhere made common life with the poor, choosing for their houses the most neglected quarters—in London the stinking lane and shambles of Newgate,—helping the labourers to gather the olives or strip the vineyards ; ministering to the lepers, and undertaking the coars-

est toils imposed by charity; singing the while their hymns of joy, or making merry, like children at a feast, over the broken scraps tossed to them from the rich man's table. The servants of God, said St. Francis, are really "jugglers" and "must revive the hearts of men" and lead them to spiritual joy. He called himself "God's troubadour"; he deemed perfection and joy equivalent terms. The astonishing thing is that St. Francis made thousands to feel the truth of this transcendent optimism.

With these necessary cautions we are now in a position to approach the abstract question: what was it in the mediæval Church that especially enabled it to fulfill its task as the formative factor in mediæval civilization? We shall best obtain an answer by asking the further question: what were the essential features of the barbarians whose taming fell to the lot of the Church? By this we do not intend a catalogue of vices—cruelty, lust, bloodshed, and the like. These, it might fairly be contended, were as marked characteristics of the Romans as of the barbarian victors. We would look deeper; can we find in barbarism a general formula of which its various aspects are in the main the expression? Can we find a similar general formula that is characteristic of the life of the mediæval Church? We think we can.

The great central principle of barbarism, as we see it at work in the Western world on the break up of the Empire, is its essential individualism. The limit of outlook is the local tribe; neighbour and enemy are almost interchangeable terms. The one bond of solidarity is the great chief, and the usages, customs and taboos that centuries of superstition had turned

into bonds more unbreakable than steel. The state as state—a collective fact, not the mere expression of loyalty to or fear of the individual chief—is unknown. In consequence all political matters are in constant flux. As in the lower organisms, kingdoms divide and subdivide, or reunite their fragments, with amazing facility. Generalizations are often dangerous, but we shall not err widely in summing up the inner spirit of barbarism as unregulated individualism, or anarchism.

One illustration of this position must suffice. The Viking, sailing from his Northern home, thinks little or nothing of the spread of his empire, casts few looks behind, is bound by no links of loyalty. The sentiments which in a later age were an excuse or justification for conquest were wholly lacking. He sails hither and thither—Normandy, Ireland, Constantinople itself, no matter where,—indifferent to all save the impulses of the moment. If he settles, it is not as a colonist pushing forward the frontiers of his native state. Whether as Varangian in Russia, or Norman in France, he forgets the old and founds a new home. The very intensity of his individualism, unfettered by national or local outlook or lasting tradition, enables him rapidly to adapt himself to his new environment. Even language, the one feature, besides his religion, which links him to his former associates, is to him so essentially an individual matter that he is willing, under pressure, to cast it aside for the tongue of the people he has conquered, as he had already cast aside his rude religion. The Frank in Gaul, the Norman in France or Apulia, the Varangian in

Russia, the Lombard in Italy are but a few of the illustrations of this principle that we could furnish. In Russia the house of the Norseman, Rurik, became the ruling family of a Slav people.

Nor was it only among the barbarians that we find particularist tendencies. We see the same fatal process at work in states at one remove from barbarism, *e. g.*, in the Carolingian Empire. Or, perhaps, it would be more accurate to look upon the Empire founded by Charles the Great as itself the interlude. By his genius he had knit together for a while a dismembered Europe. With his death a fictitious order once more gives place to natural anarchy, and his empire dissolves into its primitive units. For centuries this seemed to be the law of politics. The kingdom, whose unity has been painfully accomplished by the labours of some hero, ever tends to fall back into an aggregation of counties loosely bound together by shadowy ties, which are yet too weak to prevent constant, internecine strife. The period of the Heptarchy followed in the eleventh century by the great Saxon earldoms was not peculiar to England; what was peculiar was the speedy deliverance of our country, through the great blessing of the Norman Conquest, from the centrifugal forces which on the Continent, especially in Germany, wrecked all attempts at political unity. Not until three hundred years later was France enabled to establish a centralized authority, while even then such great fiefs as Brittany, Burgundy, and Toulouse ever threatened disintegration. The student of to-day is apt to be misled by such modern facts as Spain, Italy and Germany into forgetting

that in the Middle Ages these countries were split up into an indescribable number of semi-independent duchies, counties, bishoprics, and the like. In Germany, for instance, at the Reformation there were 2,000 different states, only loosely held together in the unity of the Holy Roman Empire. Spain, after suffering much from its Saracen invaders, only became one at the dawn of the Reformation. Italy has had to wait for its unity until a time within recent memory. But for the assistance given by the Church the forces of disintegration might have become supreme.

In contrast to this unregulated individualism of the barbarian, we find, when we proceed to examine the mediæval economy, that its essential fact is the principle of solidarity. The effort of human society in the Middle Ages is to fit itself in with great institutions, or rather with the governing ideas of such institutions, by the sinking of the individual in some form of corporate life. This it was that gave its strength to feudalism, which, on one side of its theory, is the attempt to give every man his place in the social economy. But feudalism was but the half-way house to an ideal still higher. Instead of the struggle of clan with clan we find the conception of a world-empire and a world-Church, each so organized and planned that every part falls naturally into its own place. Of these two the second is the more important; the unity of all in one Catholic Church under one spiritual head, the pope, the representative of Christ, lies at the root of the notion of one Holy Roman Empire under an emperor or representative of Cæsar. But this concep-

tion of the Holy Roman Empire, linked up as it was with the supremacy of the papacy, is too important to be dismissed in a paragraph, and will demand further investigation. Suffice for the present that we note that by how much more Christ is greater than Cæsar by so much more must the unity of all in one Church exceed the unity of all in one Empire; let alone that the first was real, the second but a dream.

The absorption of the individual into a corporation, primarily spiritual but with a secondary outlook upon the political, is thus the key to mediæval life and thought. We have an illustration of this in the greatest and most characteristic of all mediæval poems. Dante's "Divine Comedy" represents for us the salvation of the poet, but that salvation is only achieved by a scheme which brings within its compass universal man, and which takes us for its accomplishment through all the circles of earth, heaven and hell. The religious life of the individual was but in a slight sense a matter of his own experience. The value and place of experience, in fact, was rediscovered by Luther, though wrapped up by him in his cryptic watchword: the just shall live by faith. But from first to last the mediæval man and the life of his soul was conditioned and determined by his corporate relations; his baptism into the corporation; his participation in her sacraments; his dependence upon a priestly caste, and the like. Just as in the secular mediæval state the life of the individual was conditioned by his guild, rank, occupation or city in a way and to a degree of which we have to-day illustrations only in the dreams of

socialists, so, even more strictly, in the mediæval spiritual life. In fact, it was the training in the consciousness of solidarity, given from cradle to grave by the Church, that alone made possible the emphasis placed upon corporate life in the civil estate.

We are, at length, in a position to answer our question: What was the characteristic force in the mediæval Church that made for civilization, leaving aside for the moment its definite spiritual activities? We find it in this consciousness of solidarity. This it was, as we shall see later, that was the strength of the papacy, and that gave to the greatest of mediæval institutions, Monasticism, its persistent vitality. But, in reality, this principle is none other than the translation into new spiritual terms of the root principles of the old Roman Empire, into whose dominion the Church had stepped, whose genius for administration she had inherited, whose work she was destined to carry on to still higher issues. This consciousness of solidarity, enforced by all the sanctions and fears of another world of which he was ever reminded that he was already a part, subdued the individualism of the barbarian, with its vagaries and divisions, and forced him slowly to adapt himself to the needs, limitations and service of a society with a wider outlook than the clan and its struggles. Through the same consciousness he slowly learned to realize both what he owed to posterity and his indebtedness to the past. As we might naturally expect this last came first. The intellectual work of the Dark Ages, until the dawn of Scholasticism, was the laborious, often unintelligent appropriation of

the patristic and classical material that had survived destruction.

Furthermore in this emphasis of solidarity we see the force which prepared the new races to receive the inheritance of law and order which had come down to them from Rome. The Church by its great essential ideas made ready the soil, dug about the roots, rendered possible in different ways the renewed vitality of the withered but undying principles of Roman and Hellenic civilization. The secret of civilization is growth combined with continuity; progress is never the result of cataclysm. The Church by its unity of organization and ritual, as well as by its insistence upon one common language, not only supplied the element of continuity with older cultures, but added the stimulus to development and growth. It took the *disjecta membra* of its antique and patristic heritages and by a synthesis of its own gave them new life and meaning.

The student should not forget that the emphasis laid by the Church upon solidarity was not material only; it demanded from all the apperception of certain ideas. The gross materialism of much of the corporate life of the mediæval Church cannot be denied; but even the most superstitious devotee could not fail to be conscious at sundry times and in divers ways of the existence of a great spiritual society the bounds of which, both past and future, were in the infinite distances. For the mediæval man, glorious saint or desperate sinner alike, the all important aim was salvation, though the sinner oftentimes ventured upon a mighty gamble in futures, with his soul as the stake. By many differing ways

(superstitious or otherwise need not now detain us), saint and sinner alike were forced to realize that this salvation depended completely upon union with a Church visible and invisible, upon forces spiritual, far-reaching, infinite, that transcended the little circle of his immediate sensations. The central rite of his worship, though full of crude, materialistic interpretations, nevertheless ever impressed upon him that the cardinal fact was the real presence of Christ. Even the worship of the saints, harmful as it may have been in some of its expressions, linked the worshipper with the great cloud of witnesses, and reminded him that the faith of the present had its roots in the historic past. The solidarity of the Church Triumphant with the Church Militant was more than an article in the Creed; it was daily brought home to the believer by symbol, usage and superstition. For whatever the superstition or ignorance of the Middle Ages—and we are not careful to minimize these matters—underlying all we may find the presence of potent ideas that drove men to look before and after to realize the circles beyond circles of life and thought, past, present and future, that were concerned about him, and of which his life formed a part. But it is precisely the absence of such ideas that constitutes barbarism—or its modern equivalent, bourgeois Philistinism—with its concentration upon the needs, appetites and pleasures of the moment; it is the presence above all else of such ideas that makes for civilization and the higher life of the soul, in spite of all imperfection in the medium in which the ideas work.

This consciousness of solidarity, so fundamental in

the mediæval Church, was of immense social as well as spiritual significance; it took the disintegrated units of life and society that survived the barbarian invasions and built them up into a new order, drawing strength even from the prevalent decay. By its more spiritual conceptions, above all by the homage which in the worship of the Crucified it ever paid to renunciation, the Church slowly broke up the military ideas of feudalism, and for brute force and passion substituted law and order. Its doctrine of the unity of the human race, both in Adam and in Christ, was destined to prove fatal to all serfdom and slavery. Even the mediæval doctrine of sin, strangely destitute as it generally proved in the more spiritual elements, by its essentially social rather than individualistic outlook, its human rather than Godward content, became, as we have already seen, through the social sanctions imposed, a powerful instrument in the suppression of barbarian tempers and customs.

One objection to this generalization is so obvious that it needs to be met. Neglecting for the moment the spiritual forces, we have emphasized the solidarity of the Catholic Church as the root idea which gave her power to tame the individualism of the barbarian. But historians have pointed out that the Reformation was the protest of the individual against an organization which gave the individual as such little or no place. How then, it may be asked, can the Reformation be looked upon as a factor in advancing civilization, when it appears to be a set-back to ideas from which humanity had been emancipated by the mediæval Church?

The answer is clear. The individualism of the

Reformation was not the individualism of the barbarian; it was an individualism of thought, not of action. Unregulated individualism in action, whether in the fifth-century Vandal or the twentieth-century manufacturer, leads to inefficiency and anarchy; individualism in thought, however ill regulated, makes for liberty, and thus, in the long run, for righteousness. A true individualism may rightly be claimed to be the highest and rarest product of human development, but such individualism does not come first in the order of time, for we cannot claim to discern its roots in the anarchic selfishness of the barbarian. In the historical order solidarity comes first, alone making possible the civilization in which this higher individualism—genius, personal magnetism, leadership, lofty thought, the artist's touch, the poet's vision—call it what we will—shall have its truest chance. Moreover the historian is bound to confess that a true development of individualism is so rare and difficult that society is ever being driven back once again upon the principles of solidarity to supply the necessary correction. In the great crisis through which Europe is now passing we see the exaggeration of each of these principles, and the correction in both which the conflict between them is bound to produce, unless indeed the world shall have suffered in vain.

Moreover, the protest of individualism was not the only feature of the Reformation. Side by side with it we see the revolt of nationalism, the determination of the Western nations to work out their own life on their own lines. Not without cause was it that the Free Cities of Germany, almost without exception, embraced the Reformation, even when surrounded

with a hostile population, as in the case of Geneva and the Savoy. But nationalism and individualism necessarily contain contradictory elements. In the play of these two principles—the greater opportunity of the individual as such, the expression of the necessary solidarity in the development of the national rather than in the insistence upon unity of creed, ritual and organization—united only in their protest against the common tyranny of Rome, we discern the cause and trace the varying phases of the Reformation. But to this phase of the matter we shall return again.

IV

We have reserved for our conclusion the supreme instance of mediæval solidarity. We refer to the papacy, with its twin conception of the Holy Roman Empire. For the unity of all in one Catholic Church under one head, the pope, was but the counterpart of the unity of all in one Empire, under one emperor. Of both unities the necessary centre was Rome.

The student who would investigate the part that the papacy has played in the evolution of society should realize at the outset that the mediæval Church was not so much a Church, in the modern sense of the word, as a State. "Convenience," writes Professor Maitland, "may forbid us to call it a State very often, but we ought to do so from time to time, for we could frame no acceptable definition of a State which would not comprehend the Church. What has it not that the State should have? It has laws, lawgivers, law courts, lawyers. It uses physical force to compel men to obey its laws. It keeps

prisons. In the thirteenth century, though with squeamish phrases, it pronounces sentence of death. It is no voluntary society. If people attempt to leave it they are guilty of the *crimen læsæ majestatis*, and are likely to be burnt. It is supported by involuntary contributions, by tithe and tax. That men believe it to have a supernatural origin does not alter the case. Kings have reigned by divine right, and republics have been founded in the name of God-given liberty."[1] But the constitution of this State, as developed by the great architect of the papacy, Hildebrand, was unique in one all-important respect. The Church was a State within a State, or rather a State within which all other states existed, a State which had neither boundaries nor limits; which existed in, was part of, and yet distinct from every other State, over the which in fact it claimed priority and preëminence. They were particular and individualistic; the Church alone was Catholic and universal, the realization in life of the principle of solidarity.

Herein will be found the secret both of the growth and downfall of the papal supremacy. For the papacy was no gigantic upas tree of fraud and superstition reared by the enemy of mankind, but a necessary factor, so far as we can see, in the evolution of society. But as is invariably the case in history this factor was no isolated force, without correlation with the past. On the contrary the patriarchate of Rome became the supreme power in the mediæval world because Western Europe had been cradled in the belief of the necessity of one world-power, to which

[1] Maitland, "Canon Law in Church of England," p. 100.

all other powers should give adherence and form a part. To this legacy of the Cæsars the popes became the heirs. The city of Rome, indeed, had fallen, but in popular conception its former power still continued, though expressing itself in new relations of Christ to Rome and of Rome to the world. We see this new relationship clearly brought out in a Norse poem, written somewhere about the year 1000 A. D. by one Eilif, who seems to have been hesitating between the claims of Christian and Thor. But of Christ he writes:

> They say Christ sits upon a mountain throne
> Far to the south beside the well of Fate:
> So closely has the Lord whom angels own
> With Rome and Roman lands entwined His state.

In such a verse as this we see the forces which transferred the sanctity and majesty of the imperial city, as also of the "White Christ," to the person of one whom men deemed to be His vicar. Amid the chaos and welter of the great upheaval the papacy offered unity of administration and law, and won the gratitude of Europe by never flinching from the task of beating down anarchy into order, and asserting the supremacy of moral ideas over brute force. The popes prospered because they stood for the solidarity of Europe in one world-state, whereas the Empire was but a dream with occasional breaks of reality.

To this mediæval conception of the solidarity of Europe in one world-state historians are accustomed to give a technical title. They speak of it as the Holy Roman Empire. This concept was the most important contribution which the Church made to

the political development of the Middle Ages. As such it deserves the fullest examination; without the understanding of this concept the Middle Ages are a sealed mystery.

As is invariably the case with all living concepts this idea had its roots in the historic past. This point, to which we have already alluded, is of the highest importance. In spite of her sack by Alaric Rome was still to all men the imperial city; the idea of her empire had become a necessary part of the world's order. The traveller might tell how Rome lay in ruins, with a population reduced to less than fifty thousand, with a trade that was almost limited to dealing in relics, but men never doubted that her dominion was still universal. To her divinely appointed sway there could be neither bounds nor barriers. In her alone could the proud prophecy of the poet attain reality—

> His ego, nec metas rerum, nec tempora pono,
> Imperium sine fine dedi.

The mother of martyrs, the home of the apostles, the city of consuls and tribunes, she was still the source of all power. Though a widow, she was none the less a queen. Her barbaric conquerors might beat down her walls and destroy her palaces, yet they bowed before the memory of her mighty deed, and were not unwilling to hold their countries as fiefs of Rome. As the successive swarms of Goths, Burgundians, Lombards, Franks and Teutons swept over Italy and Gaul, they one and all sought to identify themselves with the system they were thoughtlessly destroying. Not one of them dared to establish his

seat in the ancient capital, or inhabit the palace of the Cæsars; they asked and received the consular office, and reigned as the titular vicars of the emperor at Constantinople. Even the greatest of the barbarians, Theodoric the Ostrogoth, ruled from his palace at Verona as the nominal lieutenant of Justinian. In the Sagas he is known merely as Dietrich of Bern—no higher title could be his. The instincts of man went deeper than historical fact. The Empire had not ceased; by the nature of things that was impossible. Her foundations were the immutable decrees of God; she could not die, nor could the sceptre depart from between her feet. So when on Christmas Day 800, as Charles the Frank was hearing mass in the Basilica of St. Peter, the reading of the Gospel ended, the pope, Leo III, rose from his chair, and, crossing over to where Charles knelt in prayer at the high altar, placed on his brow the diadem of the Cæsars, barbarians and Romans alike felt that the dream of years was accomplished. The Eternal City had risen from her long sleep to enter upon a new era of life and power.

The Roman Empire which Charles the Great and Leo thus restored was another empire, and yet not another. It was not another, in that it was the heir to such assets as survived of the old empire of the Cæsars; inheriting, though with sadly diminished strength, its traditions of supremacy, the majesty of its laws, its elaborate system of municipal government, and its unrivalled powers of organization. It was not another, in that there was supposed to be no break of continuity. For four hundred years the legal head of the world had resided at Constantinople; now the

throne was vacant, for the Empress Irene had deposed and blinded her son, Constantine VI, and ascended the throne herself. But by what right, it was asked, did a woman grasp the sceptre of the Cæsars? Surely, also, elections at Rome were as valid as those at Constantinople : the daughter-city was not above her mother. So the act of Constantine the Great was reversed, and Old Rome once more assumed to herself the civil and ecclesiastical headship. Charles the Great was proclaimed as the legitimate successor, not merely of the extinct line of the West, but of Justinian, Arcadius, and the emperors of the East. He is, said men, in the abundant controversial literature which at a later date the West poured forth in justification of its conduct, the sixty-eighth in direct descent from Augustus; the Roman Empire is one and indivisible and has once again been "translated back" to its earliest seat of authority.

The old order thus passed away, giving place to new aims and larger hopes. The former empire had been founded on paganism. But with the conversion of Constantine there had come a change in more than the official professions of religion. All her civilization, perfectly developed after its kind, from its original Italic or Hellenic sources, had been deliberately renounced for new forms that to a Julian, blinded by the glamour of the past, seemed retrograde, incomplete and ugly. The pagan city of the ancients with its literature, art and methods was buried ; new Rome had risen from the catacombs. Christianity was alike its bulwark and its basis. From the days of Constantine onward the Church and the State were but two names for the same thing.

The limits of both were determined by the same causes; on the one side the ability of the State to conserve its frontiers, on the other by the power of the Cross to subdue the barbarians. In the older Roman Empire also the two issues had tended to become one. From the days of Augustus onward the secret of imperial unity lay in the development of a common religion which was but the State under a religious form. In the first century this had taken the form of the worship of Rome and Augustus, the beginning of a universal church with a priesthood, sacrifices, and temples of its own, in conception and aim very similar and yet very different from the Catholic Church with which it was destined to come into conflict. But such as it was the worship of Rome and Augustus undoubtedly supplied something which the local polytheism has failed to give, a common religious link holding together the innumerable races and creeds of a dominion that stretched from the Irish Sea to the Euphrates. To the ancient world, as in the East to this day, a common religion was the basis of all nationalism. The conversion of Constantine was not therefore the introduction of a new principle, only a change in the content of ideas—the unity of the race no longer symbolized by the worship of a Tiberius or Marcus Aurelius, but by the profession of one Lord, one faith, one baptism, with one Church, one creed, and one pope.

Hitherto we have dealt with the rise of the papacy as the expression of solidarity, the head of a world-state, the heir of the Empire in its universalism and claims. We have noted the benefits which Europe

obtained, the gain to civilization which the world-state brought. But there came a time when this conception of the Church as a world-state, forming a part of, and yet embracing and containing every other state, became the weakness of the Church instead of as hitherto its strength. The virtual downfall of the papacy at the beginning of the fourteenth century was due to this cause. Men did not throw over the yoke of Boniface VIII at the commencement of the fourteenth century because they had ceased to believe in the pope's spiritual pretensions, or would not acknowledge his infallibility in matters of the soul but because they conceived that such spiritual supremacy did not involve secular supremacy as well. The Reformation, also, in its beginnings was political even more than religious; social rather than moral; a protest against an all-centralized yet omnipresent world-power, in theory spiritual, in practice secular, which had outlived the conditions of its birth. The imperial idea, which originated in Greece—the mother of all ideals—with Alexander, but was completed in Italy by the Cæsars, was at last exhausted. World-wide administrative centralization, whether secular or spiritual, had ceased to be the ideal. The building up of the nation had begun to be revealed as the goal of history, at any rate so far as the next three centuries were concerned. But to one who writes amid the welter of a war that has arisen from the extravagant ambitions of uncontrolled nationalism the question presents itself whether nationalism and individualism alike must not find salvation by adopting, in a changed and purified form, the conceptions of

solidarity and authority which gave the papacy its moral influence in days still darker even than the present. But such solidarity must not be the *welt-macht* of imperialism, but the constraint of a common law and a common conscience, and the authority and sanctions of a common judgment of united civilization. For the bringing in of this new and higher solidarity we look with hope to the United States of America, at whatever cost, to be in the van. The New World will then have redressed the balance of the Old.

LECTURE IV

THE DAWNING OF THE MODERN SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS

LECTURE IV

THE DAWNING OF THE MODERN SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS

I

A BRIEF survey of our Argument may not be inopportune. In our first lecture we surveyed the task which lay before the Church in the reconstruction of a ruined world. In a second lecture we noted the heroic enterprises whereby the barbarians were won for the faith. In our last lecture we attempted to answer the question as to the real inwardness and content of mediæval life and ideal in relation to the Church. We emphasized the conception of solidarity as opposed to the individualism of barbarism, and especially noted its supreme expression in the papacy and the Holy Roman Empire. In our present lecture we propose to pass from abstract generalizations and to examine in broad outline the Church's contribution to the social and ethical development of the Middle Ages.

In any survey of the civilizing work of the mediæval Church we may claim the value assigned to human life as the result of the doctrine of the sanctity of every immortal soul; the mitigation of the horrors of war; the impulse given to the manumission of slaves and serfs. The mediæval Church provided

the one power that could successfully oppose the reign of force, that could uphold and maintain discipline over the passions of the greatest. To the Church also we owe the formation of a loftier ideal of womanhood, the beginnings of education, the resurrection of art, the noblest achievements of architecture. Art, it is true, soon left the service of the Church to serve pagan masters; Fra Angelico with his angels all blue and gold gave place to painters with more sensuous forms. But architecture in mediæval times still remained the true child of the Church, the interpreter in symbols of stone and form of her mystic teaching. Again in the coming of the friars, to a lesser extent also in the earlier monastic movement, we note the most successful effort ever made towards constructive socialism. While hostile to the liberty of thought the Church in her official teachings yet demanded a certain measure of political liberty, and thus ministered to the growth of democracy. Lastly none may deny the superabounding charity of the Church. Harmful as may have been the extravagancies of this charity, none can deny, in the absence of wiser and more organized efforts to deal with poverty, that it was the charity of the Church alone that saved the poorest from the grinding tyranny of the powerful and wealthy. Many of these matters are so self-evident that they need not detain us. Others will demand fuller explication.

The emphasis of the greater value of human life is observed in the formation of public opinion against the common sins of the Roman Empire, abortion and infanticide; and in the growth during the Middle Ages of foundling hospitals. That this last move-

ment became in time a source of danger to chastity must not blind us to its value as its first origin in teaching charity and humanity. As regards infanticide, the Church from the first refused to recognize the old *patria potestas*, the right of the father to decide which of his children should be allowed to live, and which should be cast into the street or exposed on the island in the Tiber. "If it proves a girl," writes a father in Alexandria to his expectant wife, as we read in recently found papyri, "throw it out." The enthronement of the Babe of Bethlehem—the Madonna and Child—was the destruction of the sanction of such crimes. Nor should we overlook, as instance of the great law of compensation that runs through all history, that the compassion of the Church for infants was largely the result of its extreme doctrine of Baptism. The hell which in common belief awaited the unbaptized led the Church to insist on the saving of life. But from the serfdom or slavery into which the children thus saved were too often sold the mediæval Church only slowly effected deliverance.

From the credit due to the Church on this matter of the greater value attached to life, the crown of which was the abolition of the gladiatorial shows, one deduction, though alas! a most serious one, must be made. The Church in the Middle Ages did little or nothing to mitigate the barbarity of the penal code. This is the more remarkable when we remember that the early Church excluded its members from holding office in the State because their judicial duties could not be carried out, as Tertullian claims, "without chaining and torturing." Unfortunately the persecuting zeal of the intolerant led not only to

the abandonment of this early spirit, but, in the later Middle Ages, to a decided retrogression. In 1252 Innocent IV, reversing the previous teaching of the Church, made torture legal for the hunting of heretics, and forced its use on the secular courts. Not the least of the many crimes of the mediæval Inquisition, the most abiding in its results was the way in which she thus poisoned the administration of justice and the methods of evidence. Henceforth on the Continent a prisoner was held to be guilty until he could prove his innocence. Moreover, every species of deceit was justified, if profitable for conviction. Innocent III emphatically stated that "faith is not to be kept with him who keeps not faith with God." No trick was too base, no falsehood too false, no evidence too tainted, if only thereby confession could be wrung from the accused, or the denunciation secured of others. The secular courts soon learned to follow the Church's example. To this sin against justice and civilization the Inquisition added studied hypocrisy and systematic self-deceit. By her own law torture could only be administered once; her agents tricked the canons by the device of successive adjournments. When at last relentless cruelty had extorted confession, the mangled victim was carried into another room, his ravings read aloud, the oath administered, and careful record entered that "the confession was free and spontaneous, made without the pressure of force or fear." On handing over the "relaxed" to secular judgment, the Inquisition, to avoid "coarse talk of flames and faggots," solemnly admonished the authorities that punishment should not imperil life

or limb, or cause effusion of blood, though woe to the secular prince that took the Inquisition at her word. In the Middle Ages the Inquisition wrapped herself round with deceit and fear; to-day she stands self-revealed in all the horrors of a system whose cruelty pagan tyrants may have surpassed, but whose resources of hypocrisy and deceit they would have envied in vain.

In this matter of the mediæval Inquisition it may be well to point out that the mediæval Church contributed almost nothing to the idea of toleration. The great mediæval thinker—Marsiglio[1] of Padua—the inspirer of Ockham and Wyclif did indeed claim that heresy must be unpunished in this world, except in so far as it may prove dangerous to society. Even in this case the punishment should only be inflicted by civil courts. Errors of opinion, "howsoever great they be," must on no account be punished. Of these Jesus is the judge in a world to come, the reality of whose terrors it is the business of the priests to uphold before offenders. But Marsiglio apart,—and Marsiglio was condemned as a hopeless heretic—we may fairly claim that toleration is essentially a modern notion, repugnant both to the statecraft and piety of preceding centuries. To the Church of those days, for that matter to all Churches until Oliver Cromwell pointed the way to better things, toleration was a crime against God and truth. In the Roman Empire, as we have already noted, toleration of a sort existed, in reality indifference due to political expediency. A wise recognition of local usages and cults was desirable, provided always

[1] For Marsiglio see *infra*, p. 174.

that the interests of the State were duly conserved; a toleration founded upon the claims of conscience and the rights of the individual soul was a matter too absurd for philosophers even to discuss. The persecution of Christianity was political, the result of the antagonism of rival claims.[1] We may even claim that Christianity was persecuted because of her intolerance of heathenism. If, like the rival cult of Mithraism, she had been content to live and let live, to bow the knee in the house of Rimmon, she would not have drawn down upon herself the wrath of Roman governors. The Church suffered because of her necessary aggressiveness of temper. We could not have wished it otherwise. An unaggressive Christianity would never have conquered the Empire.

Unfortunately when Christianity became the religion of the State the aggressiveness of temper was turned inward. As theological strife, especially the Arian and later the Donatist controversies grew more bitter, Christianity forgot, if indeed she had ever learned, the incongruity between persecution and the Gospel. Moreover Christianity had now become the religion of the Empire and in an imperial Church there could be no right of the sects to separate existence. That was deemed to be as impossible as the right of nations to be independent kingdoms. The world-power, secular or spiritual, must crush all revolt. To its credit be it said, the Latin Church was somewhat backward in actual persecution; she lacked alike the passions and heresies of the East. In the

[1] On this whole matter I may refer to my work "Persecution in the Early Church."

profound stupor of the Dark Ages the persecuting spirit died out. Orthodoxy and heresy were stagnant; the West was too absorbed in her struggle for existence. The few who disturbed the Church with their deeper questionings—Felix of Urgel with his Adoptionism (794), and the monk Gottschalk (+869) with his doctrine of predestination—were not severely treated. But in the eleventh century conscience and reason awoke from their long sleep and began to rend the unity of the Church. At first the Church was slow to resort to extremities. Some burnings there were but they were in all cases the result of lynch law and popular fanaticism. But the growth of heresy, especially the dangerous anti-social heresy of the Cathari or Albigensians in Southern France and Northern Italy, compelled the Church to resort to her older weapons. Council after council urged the bishops to stamp out error by using their powers of parochial inquisition. But such inquisition was local and uncertain. So Innocent III determined to deliver it from the whims and irregularities of the prelates and hand it over to the greater zeal and certainty of the Roman Curia. Hence the centralization of persecution by the establishment of the papal Inquisition under the guidance, as a rule, of trained friars.

To the twentieth century the Inquisition is the incarnation of spiritual despotism. Even the impartial historian finds a difficulty in so detaching himself from current ideas as to deal fairly with this terrible blot on the record of the mediæval church. Nevertheless we should endeavour to estimate the Inquisition from the standpoint of the age in which

it was established. To the people at large, heresy was the greatest of all crimes because the most dangerous. We must once again remember the excessive mediæval conception of solidarity, the conviction that the unity of the State rested on the unity of faith. Heresy was no mere matter of individual opinion; on the contrary the heretic perished not alone in his iniquity. To the mediæval thinker, individualism in thought or religion was a thing impossible; for religion and thought were both questions of society. In the maintenance of uniformity men found the basis and bond of continued social existence. Whatever therefore tended to destroy this unity of uniformity—the two terms were regarded as identical—was as much a hurt to the State as the work of thief or coiner. These exalted individualism into the license for crime; the heretic turned it into a lever for overthrowing society itself. So the Church must take care that charity work not evil to others. Caiaphas was the prophet of mediæval intolerance; it was expedient that one man should die than that the fires of heaven should overwhelm both city and nation. Better still if the rack and stake could not only avert the vials of wrath, but save the soul of the sinner. For the horrors of hell were ever before the eyes of all, a hell where infants not a span long writhed in eternal flames while the blessed in heaven found satisfaction in contemplating the miseries of the damned. All human interests therefore sank into nothingness in comparison with the duty of keeping the flock from straying, or of preventing an infected sheep from communicating his poison to his fellows. To hew Agag in pieces

was the call of God; to neglect was the ruin of people and king. Dominic, St. Francis, St. Louis, Thomas Aquinas, and Innocent III, were types of men of whom in their several ways humanity in any age might well feel proud, and yet where heresy was concerned they were ruthless. Said St. Louis, "Clerks may dispute, but the layman who hears the Christian faith spoken against ought to defend it only with his sword, which he should drive home into the gainsayer." Heretics, claims Thomas Aquinas, must not be endured. The tenderness of the Church allows them to have two warnings; after which they must be abandoned to the secular power. This, he argues, shows the mercy of the Church, for it is much more wicked to corrupt the faith on which depends the life of the same than to debase the coinage which provides merely for temporal life. Wherefore if coiners are doomed at once to death, much more might heretics be slain as soon as they are convicted.

The crime of the Inquisition, therefore, does not consist in a new departure of intolerance and cruelty, nor in its outrage of popular conviction. Its punishments were merciful in comparison with those which until recently disgraced the secular codes, while in theory its procedure was hedged round with safeguards of justice. Nevertheless, when every excuse has been made that fairness or leniency may demand, when too the number of victims has been reduced from popular exaggerations to the more merciful actualities, the Inquisition will forever stand out as a great retrograde step in the civilizing mission of the Church. We blame it not that in the days of its

origin it failed to rise superior to the moral consciousness of Europe. Its damnation lies in its stereotyping of all that was most evil in popular passion, in its fatal crippling of development, in its smothering of aspiration, and in the deterioration it induced of all the higher aspects of life. Its gigantic structure overshadowed Christendom, terrorizing laity and clergy alike. Her officers were irresponsible save to the pope; they could judge all yet be judged by none. Even its familiars, bravoes and spies were shielded with inviolability. From its unceasing vigilance no heretic could hope for escape; a long arm reached across the seas; a sleepless memory treasured up the records of any heretical family for generations; kindly death brought no release. Half a century might have elapsed since the heretic's decease in the full odour of sanctity,[1] but the sleuth-hounds of Rome will at last trace out his crime, burn his bones, confiscate the property of his grandchildren, raze his honour to the ground, and dedicate it forever as a public receptacle of filth. Her net was everywhere, and no prey so small that it could elude her meshes. She entered into the home, breaking up the peace of families, holding out rewards to the father who should betray his son, to the wife that would denounce her husband. In one case a lad of ten was allowed to incriminate his father, his sister, and seventy others; while the wretch denounced by the bigotry or malice of her spies knew neither the names nor the evidence of the witnesses against him. Suspicion was accepted as

[1] See the remarkable story of Armann Pongilups in Lea, "Inquisitions," Vol. II, pp. 240–242.

proof, and every doubtful point decided in favour of the faith. To defend a heretic was itself heresy. As Sir John Fortescue, the Chancellor of Henry VI, declared the system placed every man's life in the hands of his enemy. As no heretic could convey a legal title, or contract a debt, all alienations subsequent to his heresy were void and fell without redress to the State, no matter through how many hands the property might have passed. Where the Inquisition flourished, as in Spain and in the regions of the Southern Cross that lay under her domination, industry and commerce were of necessity paralyzed, social intercourse threatened, the home destroyed. But in dealing with the Church's task in the Middle Ages we must not forget that, historically speaking, the Inquisition was characteristic rather of the later years of the Middle Ages than of an earlier age when the Church wielded her maximum power.

II

As regards slavery the progress made in the Middle Ages was somewhat slow. We must remember that the Church did not at first recognize the greatness of St. Paul's *Epistle to Philemon*, that no slave question existed in the early Church, and that the legitimacy of slavery was generally acknowledged in theory.[1] But in practice, the doctrine of the value of "the brother for whom Christ died" slowly triumphed. The freedom of serf or slave in testamentary bequest was inculcated as the most acceptable gift that could be made "for the benefit of the

[1] On this matter the author may refer to his "Persecution in the Early Church," pp. 149–152.

soul." In Europe, by the end of the fourteenth century, slavery of Christian people was almost unknown, though the slavery of non-Christian people, if thereby they secured baptism, was looked upon as almost a charity—temporary labour as the price of their soul's deliverance from eternal torment. Serfdom, on the contrary, lingered long—in Russia until times within the memory of those still living. Its abolition was hindered by the great number of serfs attached to the estates of the Church, especially to its greater monasteries. Many of these, no doubt, originally were free peasants who had bartered their liberty for the greater security and protection which the spiritual overlord could afford. Like many other movements commendable in their origin this, in time, became a disaster both for civilization and the Church. The serfs of the Church were among the last to secure their liberty just as the towns which grew up under the shadow of the great monasteries—for instance Bury St. Edmund's or St. Albans—were the last to secure their municipal freedom. The Crusades also, which largely assisted in the emancipation of the ordinary serf, did nothing for the serf of the Church. Needy barons, equipping their retainers for the East, were glad to obtain money by selling the people rights and privileges hitherto withheld. But the Church remained at home and loosened not her purse-strings. But it is fair to remember that in its practical working mediæval serfdom was not quite so evil as it seems to us to-day. We may well doubt whether a landless peasantry, though nominally free, is in reality much better off than the mediæval villain whose land was secured to him by

custom or copyhold. We may add, in passing, that one of the most evil effects of the peasant being tied to the soil was its effect upon the position of woman. Leaving out altogether such a hideous abuse of serfdom as the law of the first night—claimed in Prussia as late as the middle of the last century—the woman who lost her husband must find another almost at once, or else lose hearth and home. The whole system left no place for the growth of finer feelings. But in this matter mediæval serfdom is by no means the greatest sinner—there are worse still existing among us.

Closely connected with the abolition of slavery was the constant effort of the Church, throughout the Middle Ages, to redeem Christian captives from bondage. This movement had been begun in the days of persecution ; one of the objects of the monthly collection allowed by Roman Law in the churches, as in all other recognized guilds, was the redemption of brethren banished to the mines of Sardinia. With the barbarian invasions such a fund became still more necessary ; and the leaders of the Church, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and others, distinguished themselves by their efforts in this matter. Cæsarius of Arles (+542) was not the only bishop of his times who sold the gold and silver ornaments of his church to purchase back the captives of his flock. When money failed, Eligius of Noyon (b. 588), in his constant work of manumission, sold even his clothing. The Muslim conquests and the terror of the Algerine pirates led the Middle Ages to found societies specially devoted to this object, the chief of which was that of the Trinitarians or Maturines. But in

all such movements the Church took the foremost part; to the mediæval mind a philanthropy not ecclesiastical in origin and control was almost inconceivable.

With the abolition of slavery there came into greater prominence the evils of poverty. From the first the Church sought to meet these by constant charity. Collections for the poor always formed part of the Eucharist services, and at an early date charity was elevated into one of the saving graces of life. The Church at Rome, as early as the year 251, supported no less than 1,500 poor people, and a similar charity was manifested elsewhere. The effects of this zeal for the poor were even more apparent in the Middle Ages, as soon as the first terrors of the invasions were passed. All over Europe the rude barbarity of the times was mitigated by a deep pity, the results of which we find in the foundation of hospitals, lazar-houses, and almshouses in almost every city and village. Nor were the claims of the poor in the matter of education altogether forgotten. But to this we shall return in a later lecture.

One effect of the mediæval habit of charity was to break down the barriers which separated the classes. Of Aletta, the mother of St. Bernard, we are told that "she was accustomed to go personally from house to house, searching out the poor and weak . . . preparing food for them, ministering to the sick, cleansing their cups and vessels with her own hands, and performing for them the humblest offices usually discharged by servants." Such records might be multiplied; they witness to a kindliness of sympathy between rich and poor that did much to

counteract the evils of feudalism, and to redress economic inequalities. But such kindliness was wholly restricted to the pious ; outside the Church it had no existence.

The call to fraternity and to the works of love which spring from brotherhood reached its climax in the thirteenth century in the coming of the friars. In the great revival ushered in by St. Francis of Assisi no religious life seemed to be complete which did not devote itself to the care of the outcast or leper or give of its substance to the relief of the sick and the aged. Nor were such ministrations confined to clerics. By his foundation of his Tertiaries or Third Order, St. Francis claimed the allegiance of the laity for his ideal. In an age when all men were seeking to enter a guild in some form or other, Francis sought to enroll all classes in his guild of "The Brothers and Sisters of Penitence." The obligations of this lay fraternity were peace and charity, while the rich were to distribute their surplus wealth to the poor. The foundation of this Order, soon imitated by all the other Mendicant orders, was the beginning of a social revolution, the depth of which was hidden from our older historians. For centuries the laity had had little active place in the organization of the Church. Now Europe was filled with a host of earnest laymen, bound together in social service and church work ; for Francis proclaimed that the life and labour of love was open to every Christian. Of this call to service we see the influences in the rapid rise in the thirteenth century in France alone of the number of leper hospitals from a few to over two thousand, as also in the formation

of other societies for social work. By nothing is the success of St. Francis' attempt to bring the classes together more clearly brought out than in the famous tale of the *Little Flower:*

"*How St. Louis, King of France, went in person in the guise of a pilgrim to Perugia for to visit the holy Brother Giles.* . . . So the porter went to Brother Giles and told him that at the door was a pilgrim that asked for him. . . . And being inspired of God it was revealed to him that it was the King of France: so straightway with great fervour he left his cell, and ran to the door, and without further questioning, albeit they ne'er had seen each other before, kneeling down with great devotion they embraced and kissed each other, with much signs of tender love as though for a long time they had been close familiar friends; but for all that they spoke not, the one nor the other, but continued in this embrace in silence."

Let us hear the comment of one of our own prophets. "Of all which story not a word, of course, is credible by any rational person. Certainly not: the spirit nevertheless which created the story is an entirely indisputable fact in the history of mankind. Whether St. Louis and Brother Giles ever knelt together in Perugia matters not a whit. That a king and a poor monk could be conceived to have thoughts of each other which no words could speak . . . this is what you have to meditate on here."[1]

We must not pass away from this question of the relation of the Church to poverty and suffering without pointing out one of the factors in mediæval life

[1] Ruskin, "Mornings in Florence," p. 89.

which made for charity. The Middle Ages, unlike the twentieth century, were not afraid of poverty; poverty was not the one evil of life which more than any other must be shunned, whatever the price in ideals or other currency of the soul which must be paid. So far from looking upon poverty as a crime or stigma, the mediæval Church erred rather in the opposite direction; in elevating poverty, provided it was voluntary, into the mark of saintliness. But as a distinguished American professor has well pointed out, the old monkish poverty worship was the mediæval form of the strenuous life "without brass bands or uniforms or hysteria, popular applause or lies or circumlocutions,"[1] the moral equivalent in the social sphere of that school of discipline which hitherto in the world at large had been chiefly found in the pursuit of war. Mediæval practice, we must confess, was not always in accord in this matter with mediæval theory, even among the regulars; but the Church of the Middle Ages was at any rate true to its Founder in refusing to recognize the ideal life in the successful millionaire. The mediæval saints and leaders never forgot the great lesson taught us in the Old Testament that God is always on the side of the poor and suffering, against the rich and strong. Great wealth and great piety were deemed incompatible ideas. Renunciation of riches lay at the root of all holiness, and in such renunciation the poor were not forgotten. Again and again we find that the precept of Christ, "Go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and come follow Me," is elevated into the obligatory rule for all who would

[1] W. James, "Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 367.

seek the higher life. In the records of the saints no text is so fruitful in producing the great crises of the soul, or in leading through the narrow gate to emancipation and light. At one time even no small party in the Church—though for the most part classed as hopeless enthusiasts, Waldensians, Spiritual Franciscans, Lollards, and the like—sought to make absolute poverty the *sine quâ non* of all true spiritual life. They overstrained, perhaps, their theory of the absolute poverty of Jesus, but at any rate they never sinned by reducing the Saviour to a bourgeois reformer preaching from velvet cushions to those more needy than himself.

Moreover, in its doctrine of merit by works, as distinct from justification by faith alone, the Church possessed a potent weapon for reducing charity into more than a pious sentiment. We must own that too often this charity sprang from selfish, fearful motives. Nevertheless, instances abound of attempts to win salvation by deeds of love of the highest benefit to wider circles than the clergy. On all hands, in the Middle Ages, even before the coming of the friars we see the rise of institutions of mercy—hospitals, lazar-houses, almshouses, orphanages—absolutely unknown to the pagan world. The number of mediæval holidays, saint days and the like have often received the animadversions of Protestant writers. No doubt they were excessive; but they did much to sweeten toil and to save it from that hopeless monotony which is the curse of the modern factory. Even the mediæval almsgiving, though, doubtless, indiscriminate and wasteful, oftentimes productive of the very miseries it was intended to cure, must not be wholly judged

by the rules of Political Economy. The cultivation of a habit if not a sense of pity, especially in a society that was in many respects coarse and brutal, is worth more than the accumulation of capital. The contempt of the Middle Ages for the "Economic Man," whose interests so strangely twisted the moral life of the early nineteenth century, would justly have been unbounded. And, after all, we must allow that the life of one humble, sincere follower of St. Francis has done more for the uplift of humanity than all the writings of Ricardo and the Manchester School of Economics.

III

As regards the effect of the Church upon war our conclusion is not altogether satisfactory. History alas! shows us that in the Middle Ages the Church stirred up many wars, some of especial ferocity. Nothing could be more appalling in its bloodshed than the struggles over the question of Investitures, which began with Hildebrand, and which were not settled until fifty years later, at the Concordat of Worms (1122). More ferocious still were the Crusades, whether waged by the flaming zeal of a newborn Europe against the Muslim, by Teutonic Knights against the heathen Wends of Prussia, or by catholic orthodoxy under Simon de Montfort and others against the Albigensian heretics of France. The ideal of peace so characteristic of the early Church, the disinclination to have anything to do with war or the soldier's calling, which led to many martyrdoms in the days before Constantine,[1] gave place in

[1] See my "Persecution in the Early Church," pp. 181–188 for a full discussion.

the Middle Ages to a delight in war, one cause of which was too often the fanatical spirit of ecclesiastical interests. Against this it is but a slight offset that the Church instituted in the eleventh century the "Truce of God," at one time of some value in repressing private wars. This Truce forbade all "neighbourly raids" from Thursday to Monday and at certain holy seasons of the year.

The whole problem of war is the most difficult which civilization and the Church have yet to solve, and alas! at the present moment, we seem further from obtaining a solution than ever. For the Middle Ages dreamed of a papacy sufficiently strong in its righteousness to curb the ambition of kings. This was the ideal of Hildebrand. Before his soul there arose a vision of a vast United States of the World, at the head of which, supreme over kings and governors, should be the Vicar of God. To the several states of this gigantic Federation should be left the maximum of home-rule consistent with the full control and responsibility of an infallible sovereign who should answer "on the dreadful Day of Judgment before the Just Judge" not only for the right discharge of his own spiritual duties, but also for the conduct of the royal underlings through whom he ruled the world. But this splendid conception of a great central power raised above the disturbances of worldly life, judging monarchs and nations alike by the dry light of truth and righteousness, dispensing justice and mercy on the evil and on the good, has been found wanting. It has faded with the common light of day, or rather has been found to hide beneath its dreamy splendours, corruptions, and abuses of its

own. And Europe, bereft even of its dream of a coming Pope Angelico, now fills its belly with the husks of Machiavelli and his modern interpreters, Treitsche and von Bernhardi. For many millions of the most enlightened peoples of Europe the dream of an all-highest War Lord has displaced the vision of one supreme spiritual head. A Supreme Court of the nations is still an airy fancy. And the cry of the Man of Sorrows still rises in vain: "They will not come unto Me, that they may find peace and life."

But to return to our theme. Though it is impossible to plead that the Church diminished the number of wars, we may yet contend that the Church secured a real diminution in their atrocity. Throughout the Middle Ages the rights of the enemy over his conquered foe were savage enough at best, nevertheless we see the slow growth of better things. "The evangelical precepts of peace and love," writes Freeman, "did not put an end to war, they did not put an end to aggressive conquests, but they distinctly humanized the way in which war was carried on. From this time forth the never-ending wars with the Welsh ceased to be wars of extermination. The heathen English had been satisfied with nothing short of destruction and expulsion of their enemies; the Christian English thought it enough to reduce them to political subjection." [1] We have an illustration of this greater humanity of war in the way in which the Church secured the recognition of a principle, utterly unknown in the Roman world, that Christian prisoners of war—Paynim and other heathen were

[1] Freeman, "Norman Conquest."

regarded as outside the pale of this charity—should not be reduced to slavery.

Moreover the ideal of chivalry—that fine flower of mediæval honour growing in the unpromising soil of feudalism—which the Church fostered and consecrated, contained within itself many softening elements which could not fail to mitigate the effects of war. True, as in most things mediæval and human, the gap between the ideal and the actual was not less in the warrior class than in the monastery, the priesthood, or the papacy itself. To Froissart the Black Prince was the very flower of chivalry, yet no horror could be more awful than the story of his cruel sack of Limoges, or his purposeless exploits in Spain. Knights and ladies were just as inconsistent as all other mediæval men and women, nevertheless their ideals, as expressed in abundant romances of chivalry, were not altogether without effect, in spite of the actuality of cruelty, greed, and lust. Through the Church feudal troth was broadened into largesse, courtesy, and pity. The ceremony of investiture of the knight was sanctified by religious rites, the all night vigil of the candidate over his arms laid by the altar, his bath as the symbol of purification, the early morning mass and the blessing of the sword. By the Christian knight haughtiness and boasting were to be held as vices.

The slaughter of the Paynim was still, of course, the main end of knightly warfare, but in addition faith and obedience were inculcated as necessary virtues. In the ideals of the thirteenth century, the "perfit knight" is no longer an ignorant brutal warrior—a Front de Boeuf, the berserker fighting for

lust and gain—but the Cid rescuing Spain from the infidel, Godfrey of Bouillon who sometimes lingering at prayer forgot the hours of food, nor would he wear the crown where Christ had worn the thorns, or that saintly king and veritable knight, St. Louis of France, whose portrait shines out forever from the stately pages of the Sire de Joinville, and who "wished for leprosy or any other bodily evil rather than mortal sin should come into his soul."

Of Tescelin, the father of St. Bernard, it is related that though "noble in descent and rich in possessions, he was yet a great lover of the poor, with an extraordinary love of justice, so that he was accustomed to wonder that it should seem hard for any to observe justice towards others, especially that they should desert the justice of God by either fear or love of gain. He was the bravest of soldiers, yet shrank from the praises which others sought. He never took up arms except in defense of his own territory, or at the call of his feudal lord." Such men as Tescelin were not so rare as we are accustomed to think. But, as the chronicler adds, this knightly temper was all due to his "magna pietas."

But nowhere does the new conception of the dignity that religion can give to manhood come out more completely than in the poems that centre round the English Arthur, and in the contrast they present to Archbishop Turpin's older romances of Charlemagne and Roland. The king, Lancelot, Galahad, Percival, and their quest of the Grail are the immortal creations of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. But when Walter de Map—if indeed it was he—and his German followers Hartmann von Aue, Wolfram von

Eschenbach, and others, purified the coarse songs of animal strength and passion by putting into them the heavenly mysteries, they did more than write a romance. They created a new ideal. Lancelot—noble, true, the "perfit knight" in bravery and courtesy, but the lover alas! of Arthur's queen—and Tristram, in whose love for Iseult we see resistless passion struggling vainly with loyalty and honour, representatives of a chivalry without purity, cannot sit in the Siege Perilous or see the Holy Grail. This is reserved for Sir Galahad, "the haut Prince," the "servant of Jesus Christ," who "bore the crown of gold . . . and had about him a great fellowship of angels," or for Percival, "as the tale telleth one of the men of the world at that time that most believed in our Lord Jesus Christ."

IV

That the Church uplifted the ideal and status of woman cannot be denied. This she accomplished indirectly rather than of set purpose. Whatever else may be said about the mediæval cult of the Virgin this much must be acknowledged, the immense influence it exerted upon the whole conception of womanhood. More than dogmatic teaching, the cult of the Virgin, under its different aspects, more especially as Mater Dolorosa, or as Virgin and Child, taught men the sacredness of the mother, and the majesty of suffering gentleness. The perfect type of the pure woman was given a place in heaven that was but little lower than God.

Herein we see another of the abounding contradictions of the mediæval Church. For writers not a

few have sometimes urged that the mediæval Church, by its exaggeration of the value of a celibate life, by the reverence it paid to those who abandoned the cares and duties of motherhood and fatherhood for the contemplative life of the cloisters, lowered the ideal of the home and of woman in special. There is in this indictment considerable truth. No doubt, as the Reformation felt, the monastery is opposed to the home, and an exaggerated emphasis upon consecrated virginity is inimical to the best interests of the State. Nunneries, two centuries before the Reformation, had outlived their usefulness; a sufficient proof of this may be found in their general neglect and reduced numbers. Nevertheless, in earlier ages the nunnery had a part to play in civilization of the utmost importance. Only in the monastic life was the solitary woman safe from the unbridled lust of the powerful; or, if she possessed property, from being forced into a marriage that was hateful to her. Into the retreat of the monastery, guarded by sacrosanct terrors, none dare break. Barbarians who ventured to insult "the brides of God" soon experienced, or thought they experienced, His avenging wrath. Hence the ideal of virginity, though exaggerated, was not without value in counteracting the lustful realities of the world around. But this must not blind us to the evil side of the monastic ideal. The monkish vilification of the woman who did not become a nun was altogether harmful. In the phrase of Tertullian woman was looked upon as the *janua Diaboli*, the source of all evil, the temptress without whose baleful influences man would never have lost his Eden. In the most popular

handbook of mediæval sermons, the "Speculum Ecclesiæ" of Honorius of Autun (+1130), we are expressly told that "nothing so estranges man from God as the love of women." That this love might be to a man the wings of his soul was a truth that was in the main hidden from the mediæval Church. On the contrary, nothing is more common in the literature of the mediæval Church, following the example set by Tertullian and the Fathers, than discussions on the relative merits of marriage and celibacy. But we are never left in any doubt as to the side on which the verdict will be given. Marriage is only a secondary good for those otherwise unable to preserve their continence. The unclean beasts, said Jerome, in a sentence that mediæval preachers loved to quote, went into the ark in pairs; the clean by sevens. "Marriage," said St. Martin, "belongs to those things which are excused, but virginity points to glory." And yet, by another mediæval contradiction, the very Church, whose most powerful section thus vilified women and marriage, exalted marriage into a sacrament and proclaimed its indissoluble character. Moreover, against the lowering of woman by the monk we must place the constant refusal of the Church to tamper with the binding character of the marriage vows. She would have nothing to do with loose laws of divorce. How great the debt civilization thereby incurred can only be realized by those who try to picture the effect upon the barbarians for evil if the Church had given to the uncurbed passions of man facilities for divorce which are the disgrace and weakness of many modern states. Henry VIII would have been a paragon of self-re-

straint in comparison with some of the results that would have followed.

The contradictions in mediæval teaching as regards woman and marriage are capable of explanation. When we examine the matter in detail we find that the vilification of woman and marriage was the work of the monk; the exaltation of marriage as a sacrament and the proclamation of its indissoluble character was the teaching of the secular Church. Now Monasticism was essentially individualistic, and in its discussion of marriage we see this individualism in its most anarchic expression. Social claims and social instinct are altogether overlooked. The utmost concession that some of the monkish writers will grant to the argument that their principles if carried out would destroy the race is to fall back upon the ability of God, if needful, to provide other means of propagation. Such a view, in its individualistic selfishness, differs from anarchism merely by the absence of every ray of hope. Opposed to this individualism of Monasticism we have the Catholic Church, whose great strength as we have seen lay in its emphasis of solidarity. But such a principle involved, of necessity, that she should assert the sacred indissoluble character of marriage, while at the same time she allowed the anarchist individualism of Monasticism to have full play. But such contradictions, though puzzling to the more logical modern, excited neither comment nor surprise in the mediæval mind.

Though the new woman is altogether a modern creation, whose ethical and civilizing value time alone can determine, the reader should not forget the important place which woman often attained in the

mediæval Church, and, in consequence, in the mediæval State. Few nobler types of womanhood have ever appeared than Joan of Arc or Catherine of Siena. The one delivered France from her invaders; the other was the virtual ruler of Northern Italy, the trusted adviser and correspondent of popes. Few prophets secured more attention than was given Elizabeth of Schönau (+1165), Hildegard of Bingen (+1179), or Bridget of Sweden (+1373); few mystics whose direct and utter passion realized more intently the love of God than Mechthild of Magdeburg (+1277)—the forerunner of the more logical Eckhardt, Tauler, and Suso,—or Juliana of Norwich. But these characters, so beautiful and rare, were largely dependent on their mediæval environment. That no Joan of Arc could deliver France to-day is a certainty that lies altogether apart from Krupp guns and trench warfare that touches rather the change from the mediæval to the modern mind. But an age which could produce a Joan of Arc, a St. Catherine, or that rare type of womanly gentleness and self-abnegation, Elizabeth of Thuringia (+1231), may be forgiven, for their sakes, many monastic exaggerations.

The noblest place of woman is in the home, and mediæval home life was oftentimes more beautiful than we are wont to allow. Again and again in the lesser known annals of the age we find records of devoted mothers who trained up their children for service in the Church and State with an intensity of consecration which influenced their whole subsequent life. Of such were the mother of St. Anselm, and the mother of St. Bernard, and many other illustrious examples in cottage and castle. In the Middle

Ages, as in every age, the germ-cell of all that was best in the social system of the times lay in the purity and consecrated zeal of Christian motherhood.

V

Our limits of space forbid us to treat, as we should desire, of the place of the Church in the development of the concepts of the Law. We must pass by this subject and turn to the assistance given by the Church to the cause of civil liberty. As liberty depends upon law the development of liberty was of course later than the emphasis of law. In the early Middle Ages the Church threw its influence into the scale of authority, and abandoned her appeal for liberty—one great source of her power in the Roman Empire, in the days when she was a persecuted rebel —for reliance upon the rulers of the new nations. To this change, no doubt, the Church was driven through the struggle with the barbarians. To restore order where all was chaos and ruin needed not so much liberty as force, the authority of such men as Charles the Great, or of William the Conqueror. In this matter the Church of the Dark Ages was on the side of the legions.

But in the later Middle Ages, when the peril of the new nations had passed away, the Church returned, to some extent at least, to its former attitude, stripped of all the license and anarchism of her rebellious days, and became once more, though grudgingly, the friend of liberty. We may frankly own that her assistance was rather accidental than deliberate; that the object of the Church was to obtain authority for herself by the subjection or depreciation of the

rival State, especially of the Empire; the liberty of the individual was her last concern. Nevertheless, but for the Church, the nations of the West would have been ground between the upper and nether millstones, the competing tyrannies of local magnates and absolute monarchs. The influence of the papacy, from the days of Hildebrand onward, was always cast against the claim of kings to exercise authority by an indefeasible title, if only because such a claim would have been fatal to the Hildebrandine idea of a papal overlord. As a matter of fact the doctrine of the divine right of kings was an invention of the autocrats of the Reformation, specially devised as an answer to the claim of Rome. So little was it accepted by the mediæval Church that ecclesiastical lawyers and theologians were firm in their assertion of the right not merely of the papacy but of the people "to root out and pull down, to build and to plant," to quote a phrase often on the lips of Hildebrand, princes and governors.

"Kings and dukes," wrote Hildebrand to Bishop Hermann of Metz, in words that remind us of a Jacobin of the French Revolution, "owe their origin to men guilty of every crime, ignorant of God, and swayed by the devil."

"A king," said Thomas Aquinas, "who is unfaithful to his duty forfeits his claim to obedience. It is not rebellion to depose him, for he is himself a rebel whom the nation has a right to pull down." "A king," we read, "is not a name of nature, a title of office, nor do the people exalt him so high above it in order to give him the free power of playing the tyrant in its midst, but to defend it from

tyranny. If one should engage a man for a fair wage to tend swine,"—the simile as Dr. Poole observes is not flattering,—"and he find means not to tend but to steal them, would one not remove him from his charge?" The words are the words of Manegold, a priest of Alsace, but the voice seems the voice of Rousseau.

Manegold may be dismissed as an extravagant, but John of Salisbury (+1180) cannot be so regarded. The pupil of Abailard, the secretary of Becket, the intimate friend of Adrian IV, the agent by whom Henry II obtained the latter's sanction for his conquest of Ireland, John of Salisbury was one of the foremost scholars and thinkers of his age. In his "Policraticus" John makes the first real attempt since Augustine to frame a theory of politics, but his basis is the strict subordination of the secular to the spiritual. "The prince," he claims, "is the servant of the priesthood." "Vain is the authority of all laws except they bear the image of the divine law; and useless is the decree of a prince unless it be conformable to the discipline of the Church." But, starting from these premises, in some respects he is a more advanced Jacobin even than Manegold and lays down, with peculiar emphasis, the duty not only of deposing but even of slaying tyrants. The greater part of his work would have commended itself fully to Cromwell's Ironsides; any difference of opinion would have centred round the nature of the spiritual power that is supreme.

We see how these doctrines, originally formulated by the Church for her own purposes, and with limitations that guarded her own interests, could minister

in other hands to the growth of liberty, when Thomas Aquinas goes on to add to his claim of the nation's right to depose its ruler : "But it is better to abridge the king's power that he may be unable to abuse it. For this purpose the whole nation ought to have a share in governing itself. The Constitution ought to combine a limited and elected monarchy with an aristocracy of merit, and such an admixture of democracy as shall admit all claims to office by popular election. No government has a right to levy taxes beyond the limit determined by the people. All political authority is derived from popular suffrage, and all laws must be made by the people or their representatives." There was in fact no concession that Hildebrand and his school would not have made to democratic theory, provided democracy would acknowledge his claims and do his bidding.

The assertion of the great principles of liberty from a standpoint other than the supremacy of the spiritual is clearly found in the "Defensor Pacis" (1324) the *magnum opus* of the great mediæval political thinker, Marsiglio of Padua, to whose bold views on the liberty of thought we have already alluded. Than Marsiglio no seer ever had a clearer vision of the new order towards which the world was slowly moving; no prophet ever glanced deeper into the future. In his principles the modern Constitutional statesman, the modern Protestant finds little to alter; he has only to develop and fill in the outline. Marsiglio's writings give us the ideals which now regulate the progress of Europe, though many of them are still unrealized. So far is he above his age in

the breadth of his outlook that the truths he proclaimed have had to be rediscovered by the political thinkers of modern times, without even the knowledge of the mediæval prophet who had thought them out in bygone days.

In his first book Marsiglio discusses the origin and principles of governors. Sovereignty, so Marsiglio held, rests with the people, "from whom, or the majority of them, determining by their choice or will, expressed by speech in the general assembly of citizens, proceeds all right and power." For the purposes of action "the rule of the king is perhaps the more perfect," but the king, as the officer of the people, must be directly elected. Marsiglio will have nothing to do with either divine right or the hereditary principle. Such elected monarch is responsible to the people, whose instrument he is, and by whom he may be deposed if he override the national will. Equally remarkable is Marsiglio's anticipation of certain modern social movements. He would give to the civil power the right of determining the number of men to be employed in every trade or profession. In his second book Marsiglio proceeds to examine the nature of the priesthood and its relation to the State. He sweeps away the pretensions of a sacerdotal order, and would treat the clergy, in all but their strictly spiritual functions, exactly the same as all other members of the civil society. With Marsiglio the State is supreme, or rather, State and Church—this last he defines as the corporation of the faithful—become one. Ecclesiastics, even the pope himself, must be subject to the State's tribunals; their number be limited by its

pleasure. To the State also belongs all patronage, which should as a rule be exercised by the free election of the parish itself, with which also should rest the power of dismissal. The ecclesiastical property must be vested in the State which can at any time secularize superfluities to other uses.

The student, pondering over these extracts from Thomas Aquinas and Marsiglio, cannot fail to note the fundamental opposition of these two great writers. Thomas was, and is still the chosen advocate of Rome, its supreme doctor; Marsiglio, the leader of revolt, from whom Ockham, Wyclif and other rebels gained all that was most characteristic and daring in their doctrines. Nevertheless these two writers are united, for purposes completely contradictory, in laying down principles that were fatal to the absolutism of feudal society. The churchman and the doctrinaire philosopher are one in asserting the rights of democracy, and the criminal nature of absolute power. The lawfulness of insurrection was not only admitted by both, but defined as a duty sanctioned by religion. The representative character of all offices and institutions, both in Church and State, was also clearly laid down by both. The result of these ideas, thus widely promulgated, was seen in the struggle in the fourteenth century between democracy and privilege, between the guilded and the unguilded. But Rienzi, Wyclif, Artevelde, John Ball and other champions of freedom were before their age. The story of the unfortunate circumstances through which the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries saw the set-back of the principles of liberty and the triumph of absolutism over the nascent in-

stitutions of democracy, does not belong to our present purpose. But we must not forget the debt which democracy will always owe to the churchmen and heretics, who, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries for opposite reasons, so clearly enunciated the main principles of freedom.

As regards liberty of thought there is less to be said. The whole conception as we have pointed out in our discussion of the Inquisition was alien to the times and to the predominant emphasis of solidarity. But we should do well to avoid exaggeration. Scholasticism, at least in its earlier developments, was by no means the crude, unreal, hair-splitting appeal to mere logic and authority which in its later days it tended to become. The thoughts of Anselm and Abailard move in spheres far above the narrow controversies of the pedants. Though modern science cannot sufficiently express its contempt for the vast superstructure which the schoolmen raised on their narrow and flimsy foundations, nevertheless that strange system was in a true sense preparing the way for better things. And, within the limits provided, there never was a time, until the Reformation, when considerable liberty of thought and expression was not allowed, especially in the universities. As a rule, this liberty of individual judgment always adjusted itself in the last resort to certain fundamental positions of the Church, though the method of adjustment is often violent. Differences rarely touched the deeper centres, for, at bottom, the diverse schools, however apparently opposed, were one. Viewed from the standpoint of these latter days the matters which separated Gersom from Hus, to take a noted

illustration of antagonism, were as nothing compared with the doctrines in which they were agreed. Here and there, as in the case of Marsiglio and Wyclif, the unity of mediæval thought was broken, but such breach was more often political than theological. But with the development of mediæval thought from the fall of the Empire to the Reformation I have dealt elsewhere.[1]

A last matter to which we would direct your attention is the Church's contribution to the growth of democracy through her encouragement in the later Middle Ages, especially in the fourteenth century, of social guilds and fraternities. In England at any rate, though originally founded in imitation of the successful craft or trade guilds of London, Bristol, and other great cities, the new guilds had little connection with trade. Their object was the furtherance of neighbourliness and mutual help. They combined the advantages of a social club with the benefits of insurance and assurance against fire, water, thefts, poverty, disease and death. They undertook for their members the duties now discharged by burial clubs, by hospitals, by almshouses, and by the guardians of the poor. By steadying the price of labour, or by obtaining work for their members, they discharged the function of modern trades unions. They discouraged judicial strife by insisting upon their members submitting to arbitration. In some towns, for instance Coventry and York, the guilds found lodgings and food for poor strangers. In times of special need, when the bridge was broken

[1] See the author's "Christian Thought to the Reformation" (New York, 1911).

down, or the steeple in need of repair, the guilds of a town united to carry out the object. They provided dowers for portionless girls; they furnished school fees for promising lads; in some places, as for instance at Stratford-on-Avon, they maintained guild schools of their own; on the coast they insured against loss at sea; above all, they made the "Merry England" of our fathers, by reason of their incessant Church ales and other festive "mummings," miracle-plays, "mysteries," and the like. To this joyousness of life they largely contributed by the attention they paid to singing, in many places maintaining a special song-master.

From the first the guilds were strictly associated with the Church. Each guild linked itself on to some special saint, whose feast-day it kept with processions and banquets, and for whose service it provided priests, candles, and funds. The wealthier guilds even maintained chaplains of their own, at the cost of ten marks a year—the salary in those days of the headmaster of Eton—to offer masses for the quick and the dead. On Corpus Christi day the guilds of a town, especially in a cathedral city, united in a gigantic procession. On the death of any member the whole guild attended the funeral, and saw to it that the family was not left without support.

The popularity of these guilds, if we may judge from their number and rapid growth, was extraordinary. In London there were at least ninety of them connected with parish churches. There were fifty-five at Lynn. Nor were they confined to the larger towns. There were eight guilds in the little parish of Oxburgh in Norfolk, twelve at Ashburton—a

small town in Devonshire, and forty-two at the equally small town of Bodmin in Cornwall. By the beginning of the fifteenth century there was scarcely a town or village in England of any importance without them. Some of these, as for instance the great Guilds in York and Boston, possessed large endowments. Many included women as well as men. By one of the greatest crimes in history nearly all these guilds were swept away at the Reformation; in a few places a pitiful fragment of the spoils being handed over to the people to establish a school, though more often as for instance at Birmingham the existing endowments of the guild school were seized, and a small portion handed back to the "new foundation." Even the endowments for the poor were greedily appropriated by men who built up princely fortunes by the robbery of the parish. But for this great pillage of social funds England to-day in many districts would have needed no poor-law, and no school-rate. Only slowly are we waking up to the great loss to the life and well-being of the people which has followed the divorce of religion from the corporate life, the reduction of insurance and assurance to mere commercial transactions bereft of all human elements, of all care for the poor to a matter for the guardians. In all these matters the nineteenth century in its early years was a night-mare, not the less hideous because of the smug self-satisfied blindness with which it looked down upon ages that it deemed benighted and "dark." To the ideals and practice of the mediæval guilds, whose centre, in all their attempts to realize brotherhood, was the Church, the twentieth century delivered, as

we trust, from a degrading and selfish political economy, and from the dominance of capitalism would do well to return, though, of course, such return must be on new lines adapted to a new age.

LECTURE V

THE MONKS AND THEIR WORK

LECTURE V

THE MONKS AND THEIR WORK

I

IN any estimate of the Church's task in the Middle Ages and the means whereby she accomplished it it is impossible to ignore the work of Monasticism. In our present lecture we propose to touch briefly upon the origins and development of Monasticism in mediæval times, and then to dwell more fully upon its effects and teaching.

In the religious life of the Middle Ages the two distinguishing features are the power of the papacy and the strength of Monasticism. The two were mutually dependent. It was by no accident of history that the political fall of the papacy coincided with the dissolution of Monasticism. But for the help of Rome the monasteries could not have resisted the attacks of covetous kings ; but for the monks the pope would not have succeeded in building up his universal dominion. This was the political side of their work, in reality the least part of their mission. Judged from the standpoint of Monasticism's contribution to religion the monk, as we have seen already, was the pioneer missionary of the Church. When the zeal of the Benedictines and Cistercians grew cold this missionary work was taken up by the new orders of

friars, who as early as 1308 reached Persia itself and in 1326 established themselves in Ceylon. Apart from this in the tenth and eleventh centuries the hope of Monasticism lay in the monastery. The monk and not the secular represented all that was vital and progressive. On the social side it was given to Monasticism to show forth in the early Middle Ages in the midst of barbarism an ordered, if one-sided, life, and moral ideals above the age; and to lay, in the midst of rude and opposing forces, the foundations of a noble civilization. To this we shall return; our first care is to gain some insight into the place in the economy of Church and State of the monastic orders.

Of the mediæval papacy the real founder was Gregory the Great; nor is it by accident that he was the first monk to ascend the papal throne. With the steps and processes whereby the see of St. Peter slowly secured its domination over the Western Church we are not here concerned; suffice that we point out the essential features of that primacy in their relation to Monasticism. First and foremost is the fact that this primacy was founded, whether rightly or wrongly, upon imperialism or catholicism as over against nationalism in the Church. In the ordinary course of events the leaders of revolt against this oppression of nationalism would have been the great national primates, Canterbury, Arles, Rheims, Mainz, Hamburg, Lund, and the like. If they had been left to themselves the natural tendency of these great metropolitans would have been to turn the Church in the West into a federal republic under the headship rather than under the autocracy of Rome;

much in the same way as we see in the early Church the great patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and, later, Constantinople, successfully claiming equality with Rome itself, save only the acknowledgment that the successor of St. Peter was *primus inter pares*. But this tendency in the West was defeated, in part by the need of these great metropolitans for papal support in their constant warfare with the civic authority, and in part by the endeavours of the Crown, especially in the Empire, in the constant struggle of Church and State to divide the forces of the Church by securing the help of Rome against its own clergy, especially against its prince-bishops. Now in this struggle of Rome with nationalism, whether in Church or State, the monk was the ally of the papacy. This alliance was made absolute when the greatest of all the popes, Hildebrand, though not himself a monk, deliberately adopted as his own the monkish ideal and forced celibacy upon a reluctant priesthood.

The reasons for this alliance are so important as to warrant more detailed examination. Of the three elements in the ecclesiastical framework—bishop, pope, and monk—the place and power of the episcopal office was the first established. The means whereby this was accomplished fall without our scope. We may say, in brief, that on its external side it was in part largely due to the ruling ideas of the Roman Empire. Imperial Rome, characteristically, added little to doctrine except, indeed, the emphasis of apostolic succession; her work was to translate Christianity into the terms of her civil service, abandoning theology to the more subtle Greek.

Even before the formal union of Church and State by Constantine, the Church had organized itself, especially in the West, on the lines of the Empire. The conquering Church took its weapons from the arsenal of the enemy. In its hierarchy of religious pretors and pro-consuls, each in strict subordination to those immediately above them, in its rigidly defined ecclesiastical provinces, each divided into districts (bishoprics) and communes (parishes), we have the civil organization adapted to religious purposes. So closely did the ecclesiastical organization follow the civil organization, and so firm was its hold upon society, that in the France of the present day, with hardly an exception, there is a bishop wherever there was a Roman municipality, and an archbishop wherever there was a provincial metropolis.

With the break-up of the civil administration under the onrush of the barbarians the ecclesiastical organization gradually tended to take its place. The bishop was not only an officer of the Church, he became one of the higher magistrates of the new State; by his race, speech, and legal training preserving its continuity with the vanished Roman Empire. A further development should be noticed. The rise of feudalism, the increasing wealth of the sees, above all the system of investitures, with its accompanying military services, its homage, its implied control by the sovereign, tended more and more to make the bishop a national prince. In general he owed his election to the sovereign; he became through his feudal relationships the king's man. In the seething of the nations which led to the foundation of modern Europe the bishop, as the count, would have

drifted off into local independence had not the popes made the bishops feel that the unity, orthodoxy, nay the very existence of the Catholic Church depended on the due recognition of the claims of Rome.

If, on one side of their work, the tendency of the episcopate was thus towards nationalism, on another the bishops and secular clergy were the representatives of individualism and wealth. When the enthusiasm or policy of Constantine first allowed the churches to hold property (321), the Church became a kind of universal legatee. Hitherto the funds of the clergy had consisted almost wholly of voluntary offerings. They now received not only fixed revenues, in some cases charged on the land of municipalities, but also the ever-growing estates which superstition or piety bequeathed for their enjoyment. In the chaos of the times they alone were not troubled by forfeiture or violence, while alienation was rendered impossible by a perpetual curse. The lands of the conquered were divided by the barbarians, but the estates of the Church were guarded by the terrors of superstition. This wealth the bishop or incumbent regarded as his own. It was his for life; had it not been for the enforcement by Hildebrand of celibacy, there was some danger lest it should have become his to bestow on his children as an hereditary possession.

Furthermore the lesser bishops were in perpetual revolt against their metropolitans. This office and power, swept away in Spain and Gaul by the decay of religious life or the whirlwind of conquest, had been revived by Charles the Great as a check upon the growing disintegration of the Church. In their

efforts to elude this metropolitan interference the bishops flung themselves at first into the arms of Rome. The purpose of the False Decretals, the responsibility for which later research has shown must be laid at their door, was to provide an escape from the tyranny of local tribunals by an appeal to an authority to which they trusted that distance would give disinclination for vexatious interference. By a just retribution, this stupendous forgery delivered the episcopate, it is true, from metropolitan tyranny only to hand it over to the stronger control of the papacy. Nevertheless, the decentralizing forces of feudalism and racialism would have proved stronger even than Rome, had it not been that in every land the leanings of the bishops towards independent national churches were more than balanced by the cosmopolitanism of the monasteries.

To the monks, at any rate in their earlier enthusiasms, nationalism made no appeal. When they fled to the desert they were anxious to leave State and Church behind them, not to develop their powers. From the first also the monasteries were distrusted by the episcopacy, whoever sought to bring them under their visitation and control. Little, therefore, was needed of papal encouragement to turn the monks who had now passed out of the first rude hermit-stage into organized communities into the watch-dogs in every land for the pope, ever ready to pick a quarrel with the bishop and to proclaim against him the supremacy of their papal protector. With Gregory the Great the granting to monasteries of exemption from episcopal oversight became a settled policy, and was continued by his successors, in spite of the efforts

of Charles the Great to check this growth of a "peculiar" within the Church. So the lists were set: on the one side the individualism of wealth and the feudal localism of a semi-national episcopacy; on the other side the monks, by their very constitution socialists and cosmopolitans. Until the reforms of Benedict the political or ecclesiastical influence of the monks was but slight. But with the formation of the world-wide Benedictine Order we leave behind the age of individual monasteries each fighting for its own hand. Henceforth the monks formed a state within a state, an ecclesiastical internationalism whose head centre, under the subtle guidance of the papacy, was Rome. If the bishop was the king's man, the monk was the pope's; the course of events all tended to make him such. If the interests of the one were more national or local, the sole care of the other was the welfare of his monastery, the spread of his order, and the supremacy in the Church at large of his three vows, of community of goods,—the technical name was "poverty,"—obedience, and celibacy. We need not wonder that, apart from all other causes, the inner mood of the two orders was a radical antagonism.

II

Monasticism in its origin was the struggle after two ideals, asceticism and isolation. By birth it was the child of the East, but there it was not confined to Christianity alone. In the Church it first appears in Egypt, where the great heathen Serapeum of Memphis, as well as the numerous Jewish ascetics called Therapeutæ, had for centuries familiarized the people with

its principles. From the East it was introduced to the West by Athanasius in a work of extraordinary popularity called "The Life of St. Anthony," and naturalized by Jerome, who in this as in much else formed the connecting link between East and West. But the Monasticism of the West was altogether different from its parent. In the East the ideal life was too often a dreamy and barren quietude. Her typical saint was Simeon Stylites (+459), "the glory of Antioch," who lived for thirty-seven years on a column and died without the sin of descending. Emperors crouched at the foot of his pillar while Simeon performed his devotions, touching his feet with his forehead 1,244 times in succession ; at this figure the admiring eye-witness lost count. Feebler successors of Simeon penetrated deserts hitherto inaccessible, or buried themselves in the darkest caves. They aspired to reduce themselves to the level of the beast: of some the naked body was only covered by their long hair ; the glory of others, called *Boskoi* or grazing monks, was their imitation of the madness of Nebuchadnezzar. They could be only roused to activity by some subtle theological argument, or for the joy of breaking down the temples and monuments of the heathen, and killing the prophets of its culture. Though Eastern Monasticism contained a larger number of well-regulated, if at times indiscreet, adherents than is often supposed, nevertheless we may be thankful that it was never successfully transplanted to a colder Europe. In the Monasticism of the West we meet, it is true, with madmen not a few, but as the years passed on the useless life of the frenzied recluse gave place everywhere to the rule

and discipline of the convent. For the West the "patient deep disdain" of a "brooding East" for the actual facts of social life proved an impossibility. In the West, in fact, the monk (*monachos*) ceased to exist save as the occasional hermit or anchorite. He passed into the brother of the common life, the chief feature of whose existence was not so much his isolation as his socialism, and whose vows of celibacy and obedience to a spiritual father were the foundations upon which rested the life of the brotherhood.

The emancipation of Western Monasticism from the baleful influences of the East was the work of Benedict of Nursia (543). A Roman of the Romans Benedict was destined to give another illustration of the Roman genius for organization and of its power to produce ordered welfare out of chaos. Benedict at the age of twenty began his religious life as a hermit in a cave of Subiaco, but his austerities and conflicts with Apollyon soon drew to him ardent disciples. These he formed into twelve communities. Driven from Subiaco by an irruption of shameless women, he transferred his flock to Monte Cassino. There he desecrated the temple of Apollo, cut down the sacred grove in which rude peasants still sacrificed to demons and built in its place the most illustrious monastery of Christendom. To this he gave in 529 his famous *Rule*. Its virtues were abstinence, silence, humility, and obedience; its duties, worship, reading, and manual labour. A fundamental law was the absolute community of all property. He who reserved for himself even one gold piece was looked on as a new Simon Magus. Attachment to the order was to be the one earthly passion, an at-

tachment which was rendered the stronger by the vow which tied the monk to his first monastery (*stabilitas*), thus putting an end to the vagrancy and lawless individualism which had so often brought discredit upon the movement in the past. Benedict survived but a few days his sister Scolastica, who had adapted to her own sex the work and *Rule* of her brother. His whole character is summed up in the inscription which the traveller may still read on the old Roman tower at Monte Cassino in which he dwelt; *Inspexit et despexit*—"He saw the world and scorned it." Within two centuries of Benedict's death (21 March, 583) his order had swarmed like bees into every land of the West. Even the older foundations embraced his *Rule*, whether voluntarily or under pressure from the papacy, in preference to their own as a more perfect expression of monastic life. The success of the *Rule* was deserved. It was not only a masterpiece of clearness and discretion, but marks the transition from vague impulses to the reign of law. Its quickening impulse was attested by the founding of an enormous number of new monasteries. From these monasteries there poured out in turn a stream of missionaries who not only carried Christianity into the heart of heathendom, but at the same time took their monastic ideals with them. Thus every new conquest of the heathen was marked by the further rise of Benedictine abbeys, the frontier posts, as it were, of the new kingdom. At one time the total number of Benedictine foundations in Western Europe was not less than five thousand.

With Benedict the Monasticism of the East and

West split off forever. In the East to this day, as for instance on Mount Athos or in the Coptic settlements on the Nile, Monasticism, untouched by the vivifying influence of Benedict, remains much as it was in the earlier centuries, only more formal and less an affair of the heart. It still lies, a stereotyped institution, outside the Church. In the East, in fact, the separation between the two ideals became complete, a married clergy[1] over against a celibate Monasticism; a divorce of ideals that in the West was prevented by Hildebrand. In the East also the lower place of the secular[2] ideal is sufficiently evidenced by the fact that the government of the Church is altogether reserved for the monks; the married priests or popes, as they are called, are the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. But in the West, monk and priest alike were under the control of one supreme head of the Church, who was, *qua* ruler, neither monk nor priest nor even bishop, but the representative, as it was held, of the Redeemer.

In the East, the breach of Monasticism with culture, and even with human society, became complete. Perched on the summits of precipitous rocks, to which oftentimes the only access is by means of a

[1] The reader should distinguish between a married clergy, *i. e.*, married before ordination, and the marriage of the clergy. This last was prohibited in the East at an early date.

[2] The early use of the word secular for the parish clergy shows the influence of Monasticism. Whoever was not a monk under a rule (*regula*, regulars), even though a priest, was "of the world." In the Middle Ages "religion" means the monastic life, and "conversion" is its adoption.

windlass, a handful of monks live out monotonous lives ignorant of the treasures which the accidents of time may have left stranded in their libraries, pushing their antagonism to sex to such a degree that female animals of every kind are excluded from Mount Athos. In the West, Benedictine monasteries became the centres of civilization and of education, the intellectual saviours of Europe. In the East, Monasticism became a stereotyped institution, a barren asceticism without history or contribution to history, except in so far as its existence is the proof that mere asceticism is not a progressive factor and leads to no higher results of life and service. In the West, Monasticism was for centuries the bulwark and rampart not only of the Church but of society itself. Monasticism in the East retained its individualistic basis, and remained little more than an aggregation of units, even where, as in Russia, ecclesiastical government is handed to it, its basis is still so individualistic that the episcopate is practically powerless against an autocratic Holy Synod. In the West, through the influence of Benedict, it became an organic whole wherein were maintained those fundamental virtues without which society itself must dissolve.

III

From this brief survey of the position of Monasticism in the ecclesiastical and political framework we pass to an estimate of its contribution to the civilization of the Middle Ages. One matter which will present itself at once to your mind, the influence of Monasticism upon education, will be more conveniently deferred to our next lecture.

In the spread of Western Monasticism we see two strangely contrasted influences working together to change the aspect of Europe. The one was the hermit's passion for solitude; the other the desire for the communion of saints. The passion for solitude drove the monk into the wastes and forests; the love of the saints, the desire to imitate the life of some famous recluse or to gain the protection which his foundation and reputation could afford against tyranny and barbarism, turned the lowliest hermitage into a crowded monastery surrounded by a thriving dependency of serfs and tenants. The illustrations of this law would be almost as numerous as the monasteries themselves. Everywhere it was the same; whether by the slopes of the Vosges or the Jura, in the forests of Bavaria, or amidst the wastes of Northumberland. Europe does not always remember the debt which she owes to those who in their longing to escape from the haunts of men, that they might the better save their souls, cleared the densest jungle, drained pestilent swamps, and by the alchemy of industry turned the deserts into waving gold. The sanctity of the hermit drew after him against his will a brotherhood of disciples, who, as at Coventry, laid the foundation of our busiest towns, broke the silence of waste and fen with a chain of religious houses (Crowland, Peterborough), established agricultural colonies in the midst of profound forests (Eversham), or planted on some dreary coast, as at Whitby, the forerunner of a busy haven.

The results of Monasticism in thus reëstablishing the civilized life of Europe have often been described and need not now detain us. But this result was itself

the effect of the new conception of the dignity of toil which Monasticism, as developed by St. Benedict, had introduced into the West. In the degenerate Roman world, as among the rude barbarian conquerors, manual labour had been exclusively reserved for slaves. In Eastern Monasticism, though systematized work was not unknown, as for instance in the monasteries founded by Pachomius in Egypt, where the inmates were organized on the basis of their trades, there was too great a tendency to identify religious contemplation with laziness. Manual labour, where it existed, was generally sedentary. But in the *Rule* of Benedict, manual labour formed an indispensable part in the life of every monk, however noble his birth. "Indolence," he said, "is the enemy of the soul." So he laid down that in his "school of divine servitude" six hours each day should be given to manual toil, and two to reading. Even on Sundays "any who shall be unable or unwilling to read or meditate shall have some work imposed upon him." The sons of Benedict, generally freemen be it remembered,—for it was long before slaves or serfs won the right to escape to the monastery—often men of high degree, as they laboured in the field clad in the dress familiar to the pagan world as the dress of slaves, or took their share in the work of the house, cooking the meals or cleaning the rooms, sanctified industry by consecrating it to the lowliest tasks. "This is a fine occupation for a count," sarcastically exclaimed Duke Godfrey of Lorraine when he found his brother Frederick washing dishes in the kitchen of a monastery. "You are right, duke," was the answer. "I ought indeed to

think myself honoured by the smallest service for the Master." Such tales might be multiplied indefinitely; we may smile at them, but their value is not the less great in the witness they give to a new ideal in the world. They foreshadow the elevation of labour into new esteem, the commencement of that organized social industry which in centuries to come was to destroy feudalism itself and shift the centre of power to the producer and toiler.

The mere glorification of toil—"laborare est orare,"—the religious significance which Benedict wished to give to all work, was not all. In one respect the modern world has swung back in its moral standpoint from the higher ideal of the monks. For theirs was toil from which they had eliminated the gain of the individual; from first to last it was toil for others; for a corporation, if you like, but after all toil for a corporation is more noble, because more altruistic, than toil for self. Toil was no mere scramble for pigs'-wash, to use the contemptuous phrase of Carlyle; it was not that feverish hustling of modern life—"each for himself and the devil take the hindmost, O!"—which is eating out and destroying the best elements of civilization. The toil of the monk was socialistic both in method and aim; though its socialism, it is true, in practice did not look beyond the corporation. But in this limitation the socialism of Monasticism was not less advanced than that of modern Trades Unionism.

This socialism—an aim in all the *rules*, however individualistic in other respects—Benedict, by his superior genius for organization, turned into a factor of immense importance in the history of civilization.

For a thousand years Europe witnessed the spectacle of organized communities where the individual profited nothing, the community of which he was an inmate gained all; to the present writer a higher moral ideal than that which glorifies to-day the "Beef-kings," "Oil-kings," and other vultures of modern society, whose appetite for amassing, for the mere sake of amassing, is as cruel as it is insatiable.

Of almost equal value with the exaltation of labour was the emphasis laid by Monasticism upon the virtues of humility and obedience; from the monastic standpoint the two tend to become one, related as cause and effect. The man who has nailed his inner self to the Cross cannot be otherwise than humble, and will show his humility by his perfect obedience. Hitherto obedience had been learned in one school alone—for we may neglect the obedience of the slave,—the school of the army. Now men were taught by a discipline other than military that the highest type of life is that which learns both to endure hardship (poverty), to deny oneself, and to obey. With humility and obedience life in a brotherhood either becomes impossible or degenerate. It is difficult to exaggerate the value of this lesson in the peculiar circumstances of the times. Monasticism was the emphasis of the truth that without discipline there can be no holiness. Amid the dissolution of old society and the ascendency of the barbarians, the lesson was once more enforced of the old obedience which had made Rome great, but in a purer, spiritual form. "If thou art truly the servant of Christ," said Benedict, "let not the iron fetter be thy chain, but the chains of Christ." But the "chains of Christ" are always

the inner constraint of a heart which can do no other. With all deductions that may be made for an exaggeration of obedience into a servile degradation of will or a negation of self-respect—a tendency that assumed repulsive forms in Eastern Monasticism, and that finally issued in the West in Jesuitism—we should not ignore the value to civilization, in its turbulent youth, of the Church proposing for the reverence of mankind as the highest ideal of virtue the life of obedience of the soldier of Christ.

Viewing the Church as a corporation the ultimate influence of Monasticism was not beneficial. The reason for this takes us back to its first principles. The earlier monks were generally laymen. The movement, in fact, on one of its sides was the protest of the individual soul against a salvation conditioned by sacerdotalism. In its earliest forms the ideal of Monasticism lay outside, even opposed to, that of the Church. We see this clearly brought out in the work which more than any other popularized Monasticism, Athanasius' "Life of Anthony." Anthony, the father of all monks, is not only a mere layman. As Duchesne owns, he neither goes to church nor receives the Eucharist for years, and yet continues in the closest intercession with God. As another illustration we may mention the provision of Gregory the Great that no monk could obtain the cure of souls without thereby losing all his rights as a monk. The opposition extended even to entrance into the priesthood. That stout advocate of Monasticism, Jerome, for instance, was ordained against his will. According to some accounts he always refused to consecrate the elements. Martin of Tours refused all the efforts

of Hilary of Poictiers to make him a presbyter. He was only captured and ordained by a stratagem. But in the course of time this primitive distinction or opposition was lost, and the monk became the rival of the parochial clergy. The first cause of this was probably pressure from without. The bishops felt the danger of communities of laymen growing up within the Church which proclaimed to the world by their very existence an opposite, possibly even in popular repute a higher, ideal of religious life to that sacramental and sacerdotal theory on which their episcopal authority depended. But the need of ordination became absolute when the monasteries found themselves confronted, through the labours of their missionaries, with the task of bringing the new converts within the organization of the Church. It is one of the ironies of Monasticism that though its inner mood was opposition to the episcopate, yet through its toils the episcopate was saved from stagnation and received its largest extension. Nevertheless the monk who became a bishop rarely forgot that he was first a monk, and was oftentimes more anxious for the welfare of his order than for the well-being of the seculars entrusted to him.

Though at first the monks had entered into competition with the seculars against their will, in the course of centuries they did more than compete : they set themselves, as far as the episcopate would allow, to cripple the seculars. By appropriating tithes, by stealing and even pulling down the parish church when they had the chance, by substituting for the rectors or parsons entitled to the tithes the cheaper service of curate or vicar, entitled only to a bare

maintenance, they built up alike the endowment and fabric of their abbeys at the expense of the parish and the seculars. In England every ancient vicarage is a memorial of this monastic spoliation. Though the friars were not guilty of such thefts yet by their intrusion into the parishes, the greater zeal of their preachers, they drew away the people from their parish priests in all the larger towns. In the struggle of the two orders of seculars and regulars the corporate society, whether monastery or friary, as usual proved stronger than the individual, whether bishop or parish priest. Thus Monasticism grew, crippling alike the episcopate and the parochial clergy. In one of its many aspects the Reformation was the struggle of the secular clergy against the regulars, an attempt to get back their own, even at the cost of the destruction of the most characteristic ecclesiastical institution of the Middle Ages. The student should note that this revival of the influence and dignity of the seculars first began in the characteristic institution of the secular church, the mediæval university. The annals of Oxford and Paris for long years are made up of the struggles of the seculars with the regulars, chiefly the friars, and the growing success of the seculars in holding their own. Of this conflict the typical representative at Oxford was John Wyclif.

IV

A word should be added about the scandals and corruptions which sully the monastic record. Incidentally the inquiry is of value inasmuch as it introduces the student to the different orders in Monasticism. That corruptions often existed it were

foolish to deny, though their frequency and seriousness have been largely exaggerated by popular imagination, aided by the circumstances of their suppression. Nevertheless, it is incontestable that until the end of the fourteenth century the monks as a body were far better than their age, better also for the most part than the regular clergy. But if the reader desires to stir up the cesspool of evil, he will find that the decay of monasteries seems to obey certain general rules. The first of these laws is this: Everything depended, as it depends in similar corporate institutions to-day, upon the character of the head, be he prior or abbot. We shall have an illustration of this in the case of the famous Clugny. The second and greater cause of monastic decay was the corrupting influence of wealth. The curse of wealth was the greater in that its possession was manifest disloyalty to the monastic spirit. The first of their three vows was poverty, the total renunciation of the world, whether the lust of the eyes or the pride of life. But in spite of their vows, from wealth there seemed no escape. No regulations which the wit of man could devise seemed able to save a brotherhood of saintly toilers from entering into their labours. The history of Monasticism is, in fact, the constant repetition of the same tale. First we have the burning enthusiast, seeking salvation in self-denial, plunging into the wilderness that he may find a solitude where he may pray alone. There he draws to himself by his reputation others of like mind, who place themselves under his direction. Or if he is already a monk, inmate perhaps in some lordly abbey, rich in its vineyards and granaries, we see him, pricked to

the heart by the memory of the poverty of Christ, setting off to found some new convent where he may carry on in stricter fashion the primitive rule, where the good seed shall no longer be choked by the multitude of riches. In a few years his lonely and humble abode becomes too strait for the multitudes who have sought out this Jacob's ladder. Wealth pours in; the rude huts of wattle and mud give place to the stately abbey; the humble church becomes the soaring minster. By their care and toil the desert blossoms as the rose, their fats overflow, while serfs and hinds, attracted by the security, build up outside its walls the future town which perpetuates its name. The first dreams of poverty are once more forgotten; all things are ripe for some new saint to make a new effort towards that primitive simplicity—the dream and the despair of Monasticism during the long centuries of its existence. Thus Monasticism falls into certain cycles of fall and decline, invariably followed by a corresponding rise; the ebbs of the monastic spirit always lead to the flowing tide of a great revival. On these revivals it were well to linger for a moment, not only because of the light which they shed upon Monasticism itself, but also because in them we find the origin of certain subdivisions whose names and special place in the ecclesiastical economy are not always understood.

The first of the great reforms originated with Benedict of Aniane (d. 821). He found the Benedictine monasteries in a deplorable state. Because of their wealth many had been alienated as fiefs to laymen, while in all the monks were a law unto themselves, though often cruelly oppressed by their superiors.

With great zeal, and still greater talent for organization, he set himself to revive and enforce the forgotten *Rule* of the founder. As superintendent-general of the monasteries of France, and with the help of Louis the Pious he succeeded, in spite of the opposition of the dissolute, in realizing his dreams. Unfortunately he attempted a rigid uniformity which turned even prayer and praise into the products of a mechanical mill. As the mechanical can never be anything else than short lived, within a hundred years reform was once more needful.

At the beginning of the tenth century the monasteries of Europe had once more sunk into the lowest sloughs of degradation—the ideal discipline and enthusiasm lost. The inroad of the Danes and Huns, the uncertainty of the times, the seething of the nations, all this had affected for evil the existing monasteries. In some the ancient rule had given place to the law which seems to come uppermost in times of insecurity—"Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." To counteract this decay, Duke William of Aquitane, about the year 910, founded his new monastery of Clugny, in Burgundy. Its rule was the strictest interpretation of the *Rule* of Benedict, at first almost an unbroken silence. In a few years it became, next to Rome, the greatest centre of influence in Europe, less because of its wealth and splendour, though these were enormous,—two hundred and seventy estates were given to it in thirty years alone,—than because of true saints whom it gave to the Church and the series of able abbots by whom it was governed. It was Clugny that led the reform party of the eleventh century; to Clugny was due the rescue

and elevation of the papacy from the awful abyss into which it had fallen. Two of its monks passed from its cloisters to the chair of St. Peter. More important than these was the influence it exerted upon one who so completely adopted the ideal of Clugny as the ideal he would impress upon the whole Church that historians have been misled into supposing that at one time he had been an inmate; we refer to the illustrious Hildebrand. Popes and kings vied with each other in conferring honours on this centre of reform. The convent was acknowledged to be second only to that convent on Monte Cassino where Benedict had lived and died. Her abbot took his rank with kings; he was *ex officio* a Roman cardinal; he minted his own coin; by the end of the fifteenth century 825 abbeys looked up to him as their head; by the middle of the twelfth century three thousand monks gathered in his chapter; while nearly twenty thousand poor people were relieved annually at his gates. From the Cluniac houses in England alone a tribute equal to £20,000 was annually sent to the mother abbey. Her church was the pride of Burgundy, the largest in the world, and its massive magnificence was in keeping with its colossal dimensions. Its four hundred columns and hundred windows mark the beginning of a new era in art.

The secret of the Cluniac reform lay in the introduction into Monasticism of a new idea. The weakness of monasteries lay in their lack of responsibility to some external authority. Such power as there was had been sadly weakened by the papal policy of granting exemption from episcopal supervision. Each convent was a law to itself. As a consequence,

there were few checks to prevent the fall of a convent into evil when once the enthusiasm within had been lost. The Cluniacs remedied this by the introduction of what we should call to-day the connexional principle. They formed so-called "congregations" under the leadership of Clugny, monasteries united to guard the common maintenance of the *Rule*. Thus Monasticism passed through the third stage of its development. The solitary monk had given place to the solitary community; this in turn became an affiliation of communities in one international organization that looked to the pope for support and in return gave him their aid.

By the beginning of the twelfth century, Clugny had followed the common round, and fallen from its high estate through its wealth and magnificence. In their laziness they reduced their daily worship to meagre proportions. Added to this was the rule of the evil Pontius (1109–1122), who, on being dispossessed by Pope Calixtus II, scrupled not to make war on the monastery itself, and to melt down its gold and silver plate, that he might pay his hirelings. By the decay of Clugny all things were ready for a new reform. In 1098 Robert, a nobleman of Champagne, disgusted with the loose and frivolous life of the monks of Molesme, a monastery he had founded himself, had retired with twenty companions to Citeaux, in the stubborn desert of Champagne. There he formed a settlement of seven hermits, bound to the strictest observance of the ancient rule. Robert himself was compelled by the command of Urban II to return to his original convent, but after a short struggle Citeaux won its freedom from the

bishop, and was placed under immediate papal authority. His successor as abbot was an Englishman, one Stephen Harding of Sherborne, who had wandered as a pilgrim to Rome, but could not satisfy the hunger of his soul for a more intense asceticism until he retired to the desolate Citeaux, which took its name from its stagnant pools or *cisterns*. Stephen was the real founder of the order, though apart from his drawing up of its usages his success was due not so much to himself as to another. While he was still abbot there knocked at the door of his austere monastery, in the year 1113, a youth of twenty-two, with thirty companions. That youth was the great mediæval prophet and preacher St. Bernard, by whose extraordinary enthusiasm the order so grew that within forty years it had founded one hundred and sixty abbeys, chief of which was St. Bernard's own foundation at Clairvaux. The Cistercians from the first resolved to dwell alone. To secure this end their *Rule* forbade the erection of a house of their order within a certain distance of any monastery. This isolation resulted in England in the preservation of their ruins. When the Dissolution came there was no neighbouring town to use the abbey as a granary. In the matter of polity Cistercians or white monks represent the fourth development of the monastic system. The Cluniacs had fallen away because they had centralized authority in the abbot of Clugny. With the Cistercians each foundation was an independent abbey, and not as in the other orders a subject priory of its parent. But they kept up the connexional spirit by enforcing everywhere a unity of usage, by an annual conference of all the abbots

each September at Citeaux, and by making the abbot of Citeaux the visitor of the order. To further guard their discipline, though independent almost from the first of episcopal authority, they yet bound themselves to the pope by oaths of direct obedience. They were thus the first of the militant spiritual orders whose definite object it was to bring the spiritual world under the government of Rome. Within a hundred years this order, too, began to suffer the inevitable internal decay, and, like the others, to grow content with the common fate of wealth and prosperity. In Burgundy they owned the most famous vineyards; in Yorkshire the greatest sheep-farms. So one monastic reform gave place to another, each adding in its turn to the vast number of monasteries, but accomplishing little permanent change in the life and character of the monks themselves, let alone of the people at large, all alike witnessing to the fact that Monasticism had outlived its day.

We must bring this short study of a great subject to a close. Monasticism as the great expression of renunciation has passed away, along with the Middle Ages, of which it was the most characteristic feature; nor were its latter days days of success. Into the causes of this downfall we cannot now inquire. Suffice that, whether merited or otherwise, the downfall, in England at least, was complete. We stand on another shore, and watch the "tired waves" of a different ocean here and there gain some "painful inch." For us other suns of hope, a different night of darkness. Renunciation and solitude are not fashionable; the gospel of Work is in our marrow;

we are hitched on to a mighty fly-wheel ; rest and contemplation are vanished arts. The world moves on for good or ill, yet every age, and not by any means least the Monastic Age, has some lesson for all time, souls in whom there glowed the eternal fire. That the dead should bury their dead is a sound rule of life ; nevertheless, we should be careful lest, in the pride of life, we reckon as dead

> " The choir invisible
> Of those immortal dead who live again
> . . . in scorn
> For miserable aims that end with self."

LECTURE VI

MEDIÆVAL EDUCATIONAL IDEALS AND METHODS

LECTURE VI

MEDIÆVAL EDUCATIONAL IDEALS AND METHODS

I

WE propose in this concluding chapter to deal with the task and work of the Church in the Mediæval World in the sphere of education. The difficulty was twofold. For education as such, the mediæval Church at the outset had little zest. The driving force in the Church at the dawn of the Dark Ages was too completely monastic for the Church to undertake, except with reluctance, a task which brought her into contact with a vanished world. Then again in educational work the Church had neither experience nor equipment. Only slowly, and through many mistakes, did she master her difficulties. The record of the Church and education, in fact, is the record of an immense loss which it took a thousand years to make good. Even then the loss was only made good by falling back upon the older Roman and Greek culture which the Church had discarded or failed to use.

At the outset of our study it is important that we should remember that education was altogether a new duty for the Church. In the days of the Empire this had not been cast upon her. Only by a due recog-

nition of this fact will the student appreciate rightly the Church's task in mediæval times. There were other educational influences at work beside the Church, many of them of a very interesting kind. But these we must pass by and confine ourselves strictly to our theme.

In the day before its fall the Empire possessed a splendidly organized system of schools, probably much better than anything to be found in our own schools down to the time of Dr. Arnold. This systematic endowment of education was begun by Vespasian (+79), and extended to the provinces by Antoninus Pius (+162). Grammar-schools, distinguished, as we gather from stray passages of Horace and Juvenal, by early hours and a liberal use of the cane (*ferula*), the tawse (*scutica*) and the birch (*flagellum*), were to be found in every town of importance. If we may trust Suetonius, the masters in these schools received the astonishing salary of 100,000 sesterces, or 4,000 dollars, while we know that in 376 the emperor Gratian fixed the salaries of schoolmasters in Gaul at twelve times the yearly pay of a day labourer. Provision also for what may be called university education was made at Athens, Alexandria, Rome, Bordeaux, Carthage, and, at a later date, in Constantinople. A system of exhibitions established by Alexander Severus (+212) enabled the "sons of the free-born poor" to avail themselves of those opportunities.

In all these schools, in the West as well as in the East, Greek was taught, though it would appear that Latin was not always taught in the Eastern schools. There should have been, therefore, no difficulty in

the Greek Scriptures, of the Old and New Testament, securing its immediate readers, without need of translation into either Latin or a vernacular. No doubt the grammar-schools of the Empire would thus conduce to the understanding of St. Paul, and the spread of the Gospel. But we must remember that in the schools of the Empire, as in the schools of to-day, there was a wide difference between the curriculum professed and the results. Greek might be taught everywhere and have a place on the prospectus, but schoolboys are the most conservative of all human beings, and the majority would profit little by the exercises, at any rate if we may judge from the confession by St. Augustine of his hatred of "Greek literature in which I was dipped as a little lad." In all probability the Greek taught would rank with the French taught in English schools in the last century—it would enable men to transact business, read correspondence or literature, indulge in travel, but would not give any real insight into, or relish for, Greek philosophy or the Greek spirit. Thus the West, unlike the East, was never hellenized and remained essentially Latin.

The value of the Greek tuition of the schools of the Empire is therefore doubtful. On the other hand there can be no doubt of the serious consequences for the Church, of the fact that the teachers in the imperial schools, until the time of Constantine, were nearly all heathen. The names of but few Christian schoolmasters have come down to us—I believe that only one occurs in the catacombs at Rome, an elementary teacher called Gorgonus. Tertullian in fact, though he did not suggest that Christian children

should be withdrawn from the schools, expressly rules out the profession of a teacher as one eligible for Christians. "Studying literature," he writes, "is allowable, but not teaching," advice equivalent to handing over the schools to uncontrolled pagan influence. The *Canons of Hippolytus*, on the other hand, of the same age, probably, as Tertullian, are more practical in allowing the convert to teach on condition of reciting a sentence of his Creed before the lessons: "Non est deus nisi Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus." The writer also urges that the Christian teacher should use his influence, if possible, to win over some of his heathen pupils to the faith of Christ.

As a matter of fact the difficulties in the way of Christians becoming teachers in the imperial schools were almost insuperable. The difficulties in part arose from the subjects taught. As the name shows the chief object in the curriculum was "grammar," *i. e.*, literature in the higher forms dominated by Rhetoric. In consequence the Christian teacher was face to face with the problem what to do with the indispensable declamations on mythological subjects. To Augustine these seemed "a hellish torrent of use and custom which sweeps away the sons of Eve into that vast and stormy sea which scarcely they who have embarked upon the tree (*i. e.*, the cross) can pass in safety." Nor were the difficulties confined to the school lessons—the shower of gold in the lap of Danæ and the like, "the wine of error held to our lips by drunken teachers." Holidays and payment were alike associated with heathen rites and deities. The first fee was the due of Minerva: at the feast of

Flora the schoolroom must be adorned with garlands, and so forth. The necessary aloofness of the Christian teacher from most of his boys, both in the social and the religious life, would not make things easier.

To many of you it may seem strange that the Church made no attempt to supply a school system of its own. You forget the age of persecution. Such an attempt would have involved the very identification which the most part of Christians were anxious to avoid. The schoolmasters were practically civil servants; they would have brought the power of the State to their rescue, if any effort had been made to supplant them. In any case the school system of the Empire was too well established and endowed for any rival system to succeed unless supported by larger resources than the Church could command. Whatever the cause the fact remains that the Church grew up amidst a wholly pagan system of education. This it continued to use with more or less reluctance. The so-called catechetical schools, of which we hear at Alexandria and elsewhere under such scholars as Clement and Origen, were of course not schools in any modern sense of the word, but merely lectures to adult catechumens on the rudiments of the faith given in the church itself, or in the baptistery. One set of these catechetical lectures—the famous Didache or *Teaching of the Apostles*, is still extant. But at any rate until the year 362, when the emperor Julian, in his hatred of the Galilian, closed the public schools of the Empire to all Christians, we hear nothing of any attempt of the Church to set up a rival system of her own.

From these facts certain consequences followed of

the greatest moment. In the first place the Church when called upon to face the problem of education was altogether without the guide of experience. This, perhaps, would not have mattered had it not been for the growing divorce between the Church and the culture of the ancient world. Through this antagonism she cut herself off from making the use she might have done of the past. At a very early date, as we see from that stout opponent of Christianity, Celsus, many Christians began to doubt the wisdom of studying pagan literature. In the third century Clement of Alexandria and his friends were almost alone in their plea for Greek culture. Gregory of Nazianzus, in his oration on his friend St. Basil, delivered about 382, speaking of the life that he and his friend had led when at Athens, is forced to own that "many Christians abhor external culture as mischievous and dangerous, and keeping us afar from God." Even the plea of St. Augustine that "all branches of heathen learning contain also liberal instruction adapted to the use of the truth" was unable to stem the tide that had set in strong against the former culture. In the fifth century the hostility of the Church to pagan literature became fixed. We have all heard of Gregory the Great's famous letter to Bishop Desiderius of Vienne:

> "A report has reached us which we cannot mention without a blush, that thou expoundest grammar to certain friends; whereat we are so offended and filled with scorn that our former opinion of thee is turned to mourning and sorrow. The same mouth singeth not the praises of Jove and Christ. . . . If, here-

after, it be clearly established that the rumour which we have heard of thee is false, and that thou art not applying thyself to the idle vanities of secular learning, we shall render thanks to God, who hath not delivered over thy heart to be defiled by the blasphemous praises of secular men."

We must beware unless we either unduly exaggerate or whittle away the significance of this letter. The influence of the grammar-school was too deep and permanent not to leave its mark on the Church. To the Fathers of the Western Church Vergil, generally speaking, was familiar, while in the East the same might be said of Homer. Gregory himself had been brought up in a grammar-school, and always recognized the advantages of classical studies for the young. What he objected to was that a bishop should teach Vergil instead of attending to his spiritual duties. Nevertheless the letter shows that among the clergy of the Church, even before the worst deluge of the barbarians, the standard of education was not high. Culture was looked upon as something external from, and alien to, spirituality. As the *Didascalia* informs us, even bishops in the third century were often unlearned men, while according to Sir W. Ramsay "the Greek of the Christian inscriptions is undoubtedly worse than that of ordinary pagan epitaphs." But it is not so much in the enumeration of special instances of illiterateness that we notice the effects of this divorce, as in the growth in the Church itself of an atmosphere, largely monastic in origin, that was fatal to the survival of the old culture. So when the barbarian flood overwhelmed

Europe, though the Church survived, classical culture for the most part perished. Only here and there in the waste of waters was there found some islet, an enlightened monastery or collegiate church, where the older civilization still maintained a precarious existence. If the Church and the school system of the Empire had been less antagonistic or more correlated, the triumph of the Church over the barbarians would have carried with it the triumph of the classical heritage of humanity, and the story of the Dark Ages would have been strangely different. As it was when in the eighth century Charles the Great once more began to reconstruct the school system of his new Empire, he could find little outside the Church on which to build. So there grew up a new system of clerical education which retained the name of grammar-schools, but which had few other survivals in common with the classical system that had been destroyed.

In another direction there was less. In addition to the grammar-schools there were also in the chief cities of the Empire a few advanced schools,—secondary schools would not be a correct designation—in which the curriculum was confined to rhetoric. These rhetoric schools set the standard for all, so that the great object of the schoolmaster became the turning out of orators and barristers. Music was regarded by Quintilian as chiefly a form of voice training; mathematics were of value to the barrister as enabling him to deal with sums of money, while the use of the fingers in calculating would train him in a graceful use of the hands. History was studied as a form of narrative rhetoric; pedantic accuracy was but of

secondary moment compared with a pleasing style —a conception of history that was only slowly eliminated, if indeed in some quarters it has not still a hold. The consequences for the Church of the predominance of these rhetoric schools, with their windy and unreal declamations,—"talk-markets," as St. Augustine called them, "in which boys buy lies and tricks for the war in the courts,"—were as serious as they were lasting. When the school system of the Empire was destroyed, the spirit of its curriculum lived on and dominated, under another form, which was yet not another, the revived learning of the Middle Ages. The result was fatal. In all ages theological imagination needs the careful restraint of a scientific spirit; in the early years of the Church there was nothing whatever to hinder rhetoric, both in pulpit and pamphlet, running away with reason. If only the school systems of the Empire had laid more insistence upon observation the literary and theological writings of the early Church might have been less rhetorical; on the other hand, they would have been more living because more real. To this absence of contact with reality, the fatal, persistent heritage of Roman education, we owe both the unreality of much Scholasticism as also the later antagonism between Religion and Science.

II

Hitherto we have dealt with the loss of the world in the sweeping away of Roman schools and education. We have noted that this loss was accentuated by the inexperience of the Church in all scholastic matters, and above all by the growth in its ranks,

under the stress of Monasticism in its earliest, unregulated forms, of a spirit antagonistic to culture. We now turn to the constructive task of the Church.

Any study of the Church's influence in mediæval education divides itself into three parts: Monasteries and education; the cathedral and collegiate school; and the rise of the universities. These were the three successive phases in which the Church's educational activities found their chief expression. Our scanty survey must of course be limited to the main outlines of a vast topic. Extraneous influences of much interest must be passed by, and our attention fixed upon the work of the Church.

We begin with the monasteries. In the dark ages of the world, from the sixth to the tenth centuries, when schools were few and learning almost extinct in Western Europe the Benedictine and Irish monasteries supplied the place. Probably this was the last thing that Benedict of Nursia dreamed of, in spite of the provision that he made for daily reading "for edification," especially during meals. As Montalembert owns, "Benedict never dreamed of regenerating anything but his own soul." The close connection which for so many centuries existed between the Benedictines and learning was really due, in the first place, to a contemporary of Benedict, Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus. This remarkable man, at one time chief minister to the Ostrogothic princess of Italy, was born at Squillace in 470. His grandfather had delivered Sicily from the Vandal invaders under Genseric; his father had been employed by Pope Leo in the embassy in 451 which diverted Attila from his purpose of marching on Rome. He

himself for many years served Theodoric the Goth as tutor and minister. On the triumph of Belisarius, Cassiodorus finally withdrew, about 540, from public life and founded the monastery of Viviers in Bruttium. "It is more noble," he cried, "to serve Thee, O Christ, than to reign over the kingdoms of the world." But the energies of Cassiodorus were not satisfied with the ordinary pursuits of monastic life. As minister of the Goths he had watched, with the bitter grief of the Roman, the splendours of antiquity falling into hopeless decay; as a private man he would do what he could to save what he might. So while he built a home for his hermits on the summit of the mountain, at the foot there sprang up under his guidance a colony devoted to learning. This colony he endowed with his own fine library, at the same time training monks in the transcription of manuscripts. The date of his death is uncertain (575?); itself a sign of the neglect by posterity of one of the greatest benefactors of civilization. For the system of which he was the founder took root and spread beyond the boundaries of Italy, so that the establishment of a *Scriptorium* and the multiplication of manuscripts became gradually as much a recognized employment of monastic life as prayer or fasting or the tilling of the fields; nor is it too much to say that on this account alone a statue of Cassiodorus deserves an honourable niche in every library.

To Cassiodorus and the impulse he gave, more than to any other man, must we assign the credit for showing the new Benedictine monasteries, which so rapidly sprang up all over Europe, the more excellent way of serving in the preservation and dissemination

of such learning and culture as had survived the welter of the times. The story of the services to Europe in this matter of the Benedictine monasteries is an oft-told tale. The schools they founded, the libraries they gathered together, the writers on every branch of knowledge and culture then known to the world that they furnished, the manuscripts they copied, thus preserving priceless treasures that would otherwise have been assuredly lost, the chronicles of contemporary history they compiled, all this is a familiar theme,—by none told more eloquently or with an enthusiasm which almost excuses his inaccuracy, than by Count Montalembert—upon which we cannot dwell. Ignorance may scorn, but a more humble wisdom will ever realize the debt it owes in the preservation of culture to the mediæval monks from the sixth to the twelfth centuries, especially in the days when the enthusiasm of their piety was as yet unspoilt by their wealth.

But we must equally beware of rushing to the other extreme, and so attribute to mediæval monasteries, especially in later ages, educational activities which were altogether alien to them. Monasteries were never university colleges, either in intention or practice. Monte Cassino might be rebuilt by Greek artists and furnished with a great library ; St. Gall and other monasteries might boast of their wealth in manuscripts, but these treasures were for their own use. Much nonsense also has been written about monastic schools. Lechler, for instance, in his monumental "Life of Wyclif" spends many pages in the search for the monastic school at which Wyclif *might* have been educated. By some writers the origins of

Cambridge have been traced to the monks of Ely, of Oxford to the monks of St. Frideswide's. The student must not be misled by these current exaggerations. It is true that from the seventh to the eleventh century such intellectual light as there was had been confined, in the main, to the regulars, if among them we count the new colleges of canons instituted by Charles the Great. But that light was rather the shining of a few stars in a waste of darkness than the flush of dawn. In the majority of monasteries the monks for the most part were illiterate, and the monastic school a small and very restricted affair. With the eleventh century the spirit of new hopes moved on the face of the waters. Here and there amid the welter, dry land began to appear ; here and there a keener eye might discern the first shoots of verdure. As the nations emancipated themselves from the struggle for existence, as the roving spirit of the Normans, then later the influence of the Crusades, brought the West into contact with the East, men discovered some of the buried treasures of the past. From the Jewish schools of Spain, and the Arabic culture of Bagdad and Cordova, travellers like Adelard of Bath (1140) brought back the first rudiments of the physical and mathematical sciences, while Salerno revived once more the study of medicine. Italy, where the break between antique civilization and mediæval development had been less disastrous, asserted her humanistic influences. Everywhere men roused themselves from the long night of darkness, and with the vigour of the newly awakened flung themselves into the pursuit of truth, or, rather, into the study of the survivals of the past. Chris-

tendom hailed with enthusiasm the new power of mind, as the hope of a world hitherto ruled by brute force tempered by superstition.

The new intellectual activity at first concentrated itself round the old centres. Some of these were secular churches; others were famous Benedictine monasteries. But the defect of Monasticism was its essential selfishness. Educational usefulness was no part of its real programme; though the education provided was generous in its way, nevertheless it bore the stamp of being an "extra." The school for the monks (*schola interior*) and for outsiders (*schola exterior*) were kept strictly apart, and of course the first concern of the monastery was for its own inmates. The majority also of those who attended the *schola exterior* were desired to become secular priests, though a few laymen of rank might be admitted. During the twelfth century, for various causes, the monasteries one by one closed their schools to all but their own novices, a course for which they might seek justification in the rapid rise of the more unrestricted schools of the cathedral and other collegiate foundations, though the real reason was the loss of their vital force. The rapidity of the change was remarkable. In Anselm we have the greatest of monastic teachers; half a century later in Abailard higher education had abandoned the monastery for the cathedral school of Notre Dame. A few years later, after the death of Abailard, we see the rise in Europe of the universities, which owed nothing to the monks, to whose whole spirit they were opposed and alien. In the thirteenth century, it is true, the intellectual leaders of Europe were the friars; but

the great wave of enthusiasm and culture of which they were both cause and result, passed the older houses by. The Cistercians, for instance, never made any provision for schools at all, except for their own novices. In the fourteenth century the monasteries contributed nothing to the intellectual work of the age; they neglected their chronicles; in some cases, as we know from the reports of Leland, they even sold their libraries. All monastic schools for outsiders had been closed, though sometimes the monks continued to be the trustees of certain educational endowments. Of the new universities they made little use, save to send a few selected inmates to study law with a view to the control of their properties or their interminable lawsuits with bishop or townsman. At the time of the Reformation monasteries were characterized, with rare exceptions, with a complete intellectual stagnation, which was one cause of their fall. But three centuries before the Dissolution they had outlived their educational usefulness.

III

The educational work of the Church was by no means confined to the monastery, even in the Dark Ages, though the cathedral school has rarely received adequate recognition. In England, at any rate, the introduction of Christianity and the rise of the cathedral school were coeval events. The reason for this should be clearly understood. Whatever other institutions in Roman Britain may have survived its conquest by the Saxons, churches and schools were swept away. So when the work of the

Church was begun afresh it was necessary to re-establish the school. For the language of the Church, in which all its ceremonies were performed, its sacraments administered, its laws and Scriptures written, was Latin, hallowed by five hundred years of use. The modern missionary makes it his first task to translate his Scriptures, prayers, hymns, and usages, into the vernacular of the heathen—but Augustine, the apostle of England, imposed upon the Saxons the Roman service in the Roman tongue. We may rejoice that he did so. The barbarians who had invaded Gaul and Italy had adopted the Latin language; the Saxons in their conquest of Roman Britain had retained their Teutonic speech. If therefore St. Augustine, after the modern method, had adapted himself to the people England would have been cut off from all the culture of Gaul and Italy, and enclosed within its sea-walls would have remained a barbarian race. The example of St. Augustine was followed at a later date by the pioneer English and Irish missionaries in Germany and other Teutonic lands.

The imposition of the Latin tongue in the service of the Church was not the only result of England's conversion by a Roman monk. The Church in England or Germany was faced with exactly the same problem as now confronts the missionary in India or China. If the Church were not to remain altogether an alien institution, native converts must be educated for its ministry, and some of the upper classes, at least, be taught the language of the Church and of Western culture. Thus the missionary, who brought his service-book or Vulgate in one hand,

was bound to bring the Latin-grammar of Priscian or Donatus in the other. So the grammar-school became in theory, as it often was in fact, the necessary ante-room of the Church. The oldest school in England, still flourishing at Canterbury under the title of the King's School, is the grammar-school connected with the first English Cathedral, and probably established by Ethelbert the king and Augustine the missionary in the spring of 598. This school, as Bede informs us, became the model upon which other grammar-schools were founded in connection with new missionary sees. Some of these schools, *e. g.*, Aldhelm's school at Sherborne, founded in 705, survive to this day though often under titles that hide their antiquity. The most noted of these schools was the school at York of which the famous Alcuin was the master, until he was persuaded by Charles the Great to become the head of his palace school at Aachen. This school at York Alcuin's successor, Ethelbert, turned into the first English boarding-school.

But the activity of the Church was not confined to the establishing of a few grammar-schools. Even more numerous were their song-schools. As early as the year 635 we hear of a certain James the Deacon at York who, according to Bebe, "acted as master to many, chanting after the Roman or Canterbury fashion"—in other words James established at York a song-school in which converts were taught to chant the services after the Georgian as distinct from the Ambrosian manner. We hear also of a song-school at Rochester in Kent, established by one Putta, who in 675 went about Mercia, "teaching the songs of the

Church, wherever he was asked." A greater influence than Putta's was that of one of the most eminent of the archbishops of Canterbury, the learned Greek, Theodore of Tarsus. Soon in all the greater churches we find established side by side the twin schools of grammar and song. The two schools, though sometimes united in small places under one master, in the larger towns were distinct in teaching and government, the song-school being the elementary school, and the grammar-school the secondary school. Nor must we forget that the cathedral grammar-school, through the duties imposed upon it of the education of candidates for the priesthood, performed also many services now discharged by the university of the ecclesiastical seminary.

We have mentioned the schools attached to collegiate churches. In these churches, for the most part established in the larger towns, the clergy lived together, or formed a guild or club (*collegium*), in part for the sake of discipline, in part for the concentration of resources, in part to secure the training of the younger clerics. The members of these communities were called "canons," from a late Latin word for a fixed contribution of corn available for distribution, and the portions which such canons received were called "prebends." They lived together under *rules* based in the main on certain sermons written by St. Augustine in which he described the common life he lived with his clergy at Hippo. Hence the name by which they were called of Austin Canons. At the close of the eighth century, under the influence of Chrodegang, bishop of Metz (+766), these collegiate churches were multiplied and reformed. Charles

the Great determined to make these colleges of clergy educational centres, and one of the canons was designated "chancellor" or schoolmaster for this very purpose—a name now limited to the educational heads of our universities and to great politicians. One of the chancellor's duties was "to correct the reading books," to see to their binding and recopying. With the death of Charles the Great many of these collegiate churches disappeared, but others survived to do good educational work. In some of the larger collegiate churches, the school of the chancellor became a school of theology,—for whose teaching the chancellor was primarily responsible,—existing side by side with the grammar-school and the day-school.

We may add, in passing, that in schools of every sort, whatever else was retained or lost of Roman methods, the use of the cane was regarded as essential. Thus we are told of St. Hugh of Lincoln that when only seven years of age "the pedagogue's scourge in such wise plied upon his back that his virtues outstripped his vices." When Heloïse's uncle entrusted her to Abailard's tuition—with the fatal consequences which have made her immortal—he particularly enjoined Abailard to flog her well if she proved lazy! Anselm of Canterbury was almost alone in pleading for gentler methods of instilling knowledge. The story is well known of his interview with the prior who had come to Bec to pour out his woes. He could make no impression on the lads who were being trained at his monastery. "What are we to do with them?" he cried in despair; "we do not cease beating them day and night but they get

worse." "What do your scholars turn into under this ceaseless beating?" asked Anselm. "They turn only brutal," was the reply. "You have bad luck," was the keen answer,

> "in a training which only turns men into beasts. You try blows and stripes alone to fashion them to good. Did you ever see a craftsman fashion a fair image out of a plate of gold or silver by blows alone? Does he not with his tools now gently press and strike it, now with wise art still more gently raise and shape it? Tell me, my lord abbot, if you planted a tree in your garden, and tied it in upon all sides so that it could not stretch forth its branches, what sort of a tree would it turn out when you gave it room to spread? Would it not be good for nothing, full of tangled and crooked boughs? And whose fault would this be but yours, who had put such constant constraint upon it? Adapt yourself," he concluded, "to the weak as well as the strong, and by Divine grace you will win them all to God."

But many generations of schoolboys were condemned to groan before educational reformers attempted to put into practice Anselm's methods.

IV

From the establishment by the Church of the cathedral school, we pass by a natural transition to the universities. Until recent years it was customary with historians to attribute not merely the schools of Europe but the rise of the universities to the influence of the monasteries. The recent researches, especially of Denifle and Rashdall, have

shown that such a view is as baseless as the myth—solemnly recognized by English law courts—which attributed the origin of Oxford to Alfred the Great. We now know that the universities of Europe, when not the result of "migration," always rose in connection with a great collegiate but secular Church; they are never the offspring of a monastery. St. Gall, Fulda, Bec, Malmesbury, Jarrow, might have retained to this day, in new and changing forms, their once proud position as the intellectual centres of Europe; that they lost it forever to later rivals must be entered against them, as we have seen, as the punishment of monastic self-centeredness.

We may best illustrate the stages of growth of a university by the history of Paris, the most famous mediæval university of Europe. We have first the cathedral school of the Notre Dame, the education at which would be confined to grammar and song. But with the widening intellectual activity the curriculum broadened, while the fall of Monasticism as the ideal life led to a demand for the better education of the secular clergy. These the great Parisian monasteries of St. Victor and of St. Genevieve were reluctant to admit to their lectures unless they would first turn monk. In accordance with the legislation of Charles the Great, to which we have already referred, the chapter appointed certain of their number under the license of their "chancellor" to give instruction in theology in addition to the usual course of "arts." At first the school at Paris had little repute; it was overshadowed by the cathedral schools at Chartres and Laon where two noted masters were drawing students from all parts. To Abailard, and the suc-

cessors he trained in his logical method, Paris owed the foundation of her prestige. The width of Abailard's genius attracted students by hundreds from castle and town to the new species of tourney, where the partisans of hostile principles encountered one another in the lists of controversy with all the bitterness of feudal warfare.

The cathedral authorities naturally took steps to secure permanence for their prosperity. There was ever the danger lest the school should be broken up by the death of some famous "master," or migrate elsewhere through the growing fame of some new teacher. Both perils would be avoided if masters and scholars could be attracted to Paris by solid advantages. Whether through foresight or the instinct of preservation, the chapter, therefore, flung open to all the profession of teaching instead of restricting it to those in orders. The one condition imposed was that "masters" should receive a license from their "chancellor." The chancellor, of course, before issuing his license, would satisfy himself that the master possessed the needed acquirements. As a result of these measures we find that, within a generation of the death of Abailard, the school of Paris had acquired European fame. To the crowded streets of the "Latin quarter," as to a new Mecca, scholars crowded in their thousands, stirred by the same spirit of impatience with the older traditions of Europe that at the beginning of the century had hurried a ruder feudalism to recover the tomb of its Lord.

A school which attracted students from different nations received the technical name of a *studium generale*. Like the English "public school," this

title was at first very vague. Only gradually did it come to denote a university. At the end of the twelfth century there were two schools which had obtained international reputation; Paris, for arts and theology; Bologna for law. Their masters were held in such esteem that custom had granted them the right of teaching in any school without fresh license. This last privilege led to important developments. When in 1224 Fredric II founded the *Studium Generele* of Naples, he granted to its masters the *jus docendi ubique*, to give the technical name by which this much prized right of Paris and Bologna was known to the jurists. The pope, of course, could not submit to this claim of his rival to be the educational head of Europe, so when Gregory IX founded his "spiritual garrison" at Toulouse (1233), a bull conferred on its masters a similar privilege. As other schools eagerly competed for the same advantage, it became the law that a true *studium generale* must have obtained charter from one of the world-powers, either pope or emperor, preferably the former—the license of the local sovereign was not sufficient to grant a right that extended beyond his own dominions—conferring the coveted *jus docendi ubique*.

The reader may ask why in the last paragraph we used the cumbrous title *studium generale* instead of the familiar "university." It were well, therefore, to explain what precisely this last term represents. "University" is simply the common late Latin term for any corporation or guild. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries the instinct of association swept like a great wave over the towns of Europe producing, as a result, that strong guild life which was

one of the most valuable features in mediæval life. Everywhere we witness the struggle of the "lesser folk" (minores) against the "greater folk" (majores), of the unenfranchised mass against the "guilded" few. On the Continent the struggle was protracted through a century of bloodshed. Even in more peaceful England the conflict was bitter and prolonged. But whether in England or on the Continent, the weapon of the oppressed was the same—the unenfranchised united in "guilds" which slowly wrested the franchise from the older oligarchies. Every such guild would be called a *universitas*[1] for the classical word *collegium* had already been appropriated for a special purpose. The university, therefore, was simply a guild, in Bologna of students, at Paris of masters, banded together to secure their rights. But when a new *studium generale* was founded, the students and masters either copied or carried with them the "universities" of the two great mother institutions. Thus the "guild" became so inseparable an accompaniment of these schools of learning that by the fifteenth century the older title of *studium generale* had become extinct save in charters, codes, and other official documents.

[1] Perhaps the most curious instance of the meaning of "university" is the following: "When in 1284 the Pisans were defeated by Genoa, a large body of Pisan captives were kept in prison for eighteen years. While in their miserable jail they assumed the right to using a common seal which bore the legend 'The seal of the University of the Captives at Genoa'" (Rashdall, "Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages," 303, n.). The reader will not henceforth need to be warned against the common delusion that a university is a *universitas facultatum*, an institution professing universal knowledge.

The University of Paris was a guild of "masters," *i. e.*, of those who had completed their training in arts. The masters were at first under the absolute control of the chancellor of Notre Dame as the representative of the bishop. He could not only grant or refuse a license, he could take away licenses already given. Evidently a guild was needed for mutual defense. The object was twofold: to protect the masters against the arbitrary authority of the chancellor,[1] and to raise their emoluments by restricting new licenses, in other words by seeing to it that the standard was maintained. Such a "university," which at first differed but little from a superior trades union, in its beginnings had no legal rights whatever. Like our modern trades unions, it slowly won its emancipation in spite of law, chiefly by a free use of boycotting, furthered by appeals to the papal authority which in this matter corresponded to Parliament or Congress. Rome's help was readily given. She was ready at all times to exert her claims to local interference. But we may also credit her with loftier motives. For from the first the papacy —with that unerring instinct which marks its earlier history, sided with the power of the future against the efforts of a local hierarchy to keep education in leading strings. Rome saw that it would avail her nothing that she had crushed the independence of

[1] At Oxford the chancellor soon ceased to be the officer of his distant bishop at Lincoln, and became one in interest with the university. This development was assisted by the fact that in the early years of the university the see of Lincoln was vacant, and that the first chancellor of Oxford, the illustrious Grosseteste, was not the man to be the tool of anybody.

the bishops, if the control of the new learning should pass into their hands. So when in 1212 the chancellor of Paris, as the bishop's representative, sought to compel all masters to take an oath of obedience to himself, Innocent III interposed. When at a later date bishop and chancellor again attempted to strangle the growing guild, furbishing up for the purpose, like English manufacturers at the beginning of the nineteenth century, an old ordinance against "conspiracies," Gregory IX again stepped in. Henceforth at Paris, even more so at Oxford, the guild was free to develop on its own lines. The bishop had lost the control of his own *studium;* the "university" had usurped both name and power.

At Bologna the university was a guild not of masters, but of students. For the origin of this extraordinary difference we must look to the different conditions which gave rise to the intellectual movement in Italy. In the north of Europe the complete overthrow by barbarian or Saracen of the old Roman civilization had flung upon the Church the task of educating the people. But in Italy the educational traditions, and to some extent even the educational machinery, of her old Roman civilization, still survived. In France until after the times of Abailard all teachers were ecclesiastics, at any rate were "clerks." But in Italy, where the race of lay teachers never died out, they were not subject more than other laymen to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, nor entitled like their brethren of Paris to the special privileges of the priestly caste. At Bologna, in fact, the "doctor" was simply a private adventurer—in this resembling the sophist of ancient Athens, or the Cam-

bridge "coach" of to-day—whom a certain number of students hired for their instruction. Each doctor lectured in his own room, and depended for his fees and pupils upon his reputation or powers of canvassing. In Italy the chief factor in the transformation of such a school into a *studium generale* was not so much the Church as the rivalry of the same vigorous, civic spirit which in other spheres has shed immortal lustre on Florence, Genoa, and Venice. As an illustration of this independence of the Church we may note that in Rome for all practical purposes no mediæval university existed. Higher education in Italy, both in the Middle Ages and at the Renaissance, if not in open antagonism to the Church, yet possessed none of the devout spirit so characteristic of the North. Humanism in Italy has always been tinged with ancient paganism, though a pagan disposition seldom prevented an Italian from counting himself a good churchman.

Of more weight in the formation of the student-universities of Italy was the nature of the chief study. At Paris the military ardour of the North manifested itself in tournaments of logic. But the key to the history of Lombard cities and Lombard schools lies—as we have already noted in a previous lecture—in the recognition of the continued existence through the darkest ages of the old Roman system of jurisprudence, though much mixed with barbarian additions. When the age of iron gave place to order, Roman law, especially the newly discovered jurisprudence of Justinian, was bound to reassert itself, while appeal to its authority was furthered by the struggle between Empire and Papacy. In a land

more conscious than any other of the root-ideas of the Holy Roman Empire, both sides anxiously searched in the records of the past for the evidence of their claims. The schools of Paris were distracted by endless questionings concerning the reality of universal ideas; for Italy the solution of the vital problems of liberty and imperial politics lay in the study of law, both Roman and Canon. Now the law is a superior faculty. While, therefore, "the artist" of Paris or Oxford was a mere lad whom the masters compelled to sit on the floor—the straw was changed only twice a year!—"that all occasion of pride may be taken away," who herded in bare lodging houses run by one of their masters, the student of Bologna was a man, an "artist" already of some other *studium generale*, who for the sake of advancement in Church or State had found it necessary to obtain a knowledge of Roman or ecclesiastical jurisprudence. Such men were of all nations and from many different cities and dwelt in their own hired lodgings. Nor were they adventurous lads for whom politics had little meaning save the riot of town and gown, the breaking of heads in the battle of "nations." They were generally men of rank in Church or State, men who could not afford to be outlawed, though often given as much as the youthful artist to drinking and dicing. Now in Italy, as in ancient Greece, the citizens of one town had no civil rights in another, for Republic and Empire never gave birth to an abiding Kingdom of Italy until times well in the memory of some of my hearers. The students, therefore, of Bologna found themselves compelled to form themselves into a guild, not so much to defend, like

the "masters" of Paris, their educational rights against the chancellor, much less to resist the encroachments of their lay teachers, as with the object of creating an artificial citizenship which should save them from the perils of the alien, and give them the law and tribunals of a privileged caste.

To the reader acquainted only with universities on the model of Paris, a "university of students" will seem an extraordinary anomaly. It may be of interest, therefore, to note the development of this rival type. The "university" or the Guild of Foreign Students at Bologna did not at first seek a charter any more than an international or intercollegiate rowing club at Oxford or Harvard. Like any other club, they passed their own rules, none of which had legal validity. But by threats of migration they wrung the recognition of these by-laws as statutes, binding alike on citizen and student. By judicious boycotting they also acquired control of all matters relating to landlords, and over all tradesmen engaged in the production of books, whereas in Oxford and Paris these matters passed into the control of the university of masters. By slow steps we see the expansion of the power of the "rector" or elected head of the students until he was formally recognized as ranking in Bologna above all cardinals and archbishops. Two liveried servants testified to his dignity, while during his year of office he could on no account leave the city without giving security for his return. At his inauguration he must provide a banquet for all the students, the wine at which must be of a certain quality. Another expense was a tournament, for which he furnished two hundred spears.

But if the financial burdens of the rector were excessive, the powers he wielded as the representative of the students were almost unlimited. All doctors were compelled to swear obedience to the regulations of the Student University. If a professor desired leave of absence, he must obtain it from his pupils; if through lack of ability he failed to draw five to his lectures, he was treated as absent and heavily fined; a weapon of use against other than incapable teachers. He was fined also if not punctual, or failed to finish to the tick of the clock. To postpone a difficulty to the end of the lecture, when opportunity of heckling could not be given, was an unpardonable offense. The law texts were divided into portions called *puncta*, and a time-table made to which the doctor must keep. Nevertheless, such was the reputation of a "master" of Bologna, so valuable also the emoluments, that we find no lack of candidates. Space forbids us from entering into details of the "rigorous and tremendous examination," and the ceremonial whereby he was made free of the Doctors' Guild: how he delivered his thesis in the cathedral, how the gold ring was put on his finger, and the book of the law into his hands, how he was then escorted through the town in triumph, preceded by the three university pipers and the four university trumpeters, and how he ended the day by giving a banquet to his colleagues, not forgetting the students.

Whether the "university" was a guild of masters or of students, its freedom was won by the same means. Our universities rest for their privileges and immunities, not so much on the Church as on the new power that was sapping feudalism and

destroying tyranny—the power of the purse. The Church, it is true, put these immunities into form, but it was the purse that won them. The schools of Bologna and Paris brought in no small gain to the craftsmen of those cities; neither magistrates nor court dare do anything that would drive them away. In vain did the authorities seek by various devices to crush the guilds, and as a first step to take away the right of migration. Such measures were wholly inoperative, for the "university"—as apart from the various colleges in which the student lived—had neither buildings, nor wealth, nor other hostages of fortune. Its sole property, the common chest and seal, was kept for safety in the sacristy of some friendly and inviolable convent; for its "congregations" it would borrow a neighbouring church. With these powers of flight, in the days before the colleges had been established, when men still lived in hired hostels, its wings could not be clipped, more especially as every city of Europe would have welcomed with valuable privileges such profitable guests. Universities, in fact, fattened upon their misfortunes; riots generally ended in new charters and further powers; "migrations" [1] in triumphant returns with sheafs of bulls and privileges. But with the rise of stately colleges the older turbulence and stir of life,—democracy first discovering itself—gave place to the

[1] To the frequent "migrations" Europe owes the majority of her older universities. Oxford (probably) by a migration from Paris about 1169; a brawl at Oxford in 1209 led to a migration to Cambridge. Similar migrations to Reading, Stamford, and Northampton, unfortunately, ended in failures to establish new university centres.

ordered and stately universities to which we now are accustomed. Migrations and other outbursts of the untutored spirit were no longer possible when every scholar was obliged to live in some hall, hostel or endowed foundation under the care of some member of the university.

In the rise of the universities the student can discern mediæval internationalism, so largely the outcome of the Catholic Church, strangely blended with the growing consciousness of the new nationalism that in the long run proved so fatal to the papacy. Of these two forces we have a striking illustration in the history of the University of Prague. Up to the middle of the fourteenth century Germany possessed no university at all. Through political causes—in part depending upon the fascination of the imperial idea, in part upon the change made from its old Teutonic jurisprudence to that of Justinian—German scholars were chiefly attracted by the study of the law. They therefore crossed the Alps to Bologna. There their special privileges gave rise to the system of "nations," which in different ways formed a feature, more or less real, in every university. With the loss of her more intimate connection with Italy, through the fall of the Hohenstaufen, Germany realized that the old internationalism of letters would no longer supply her needs. So, in 1347, Charles IV of Luxemburg, King of Bohemia, the son of the King John who was taken captive at Crecy, who had been elected to the crown of the Empire, founded the University of Prague. There from the very first the new nationalism manifested itself in constant quarrels between the Czechs and Germans. That an opinion

was embraced by the Teutons was sufficient reason for its rejection by the Czechs. The Teutons were Nominalists; the Czechs must needs, therefore, be the champions of Realism. When therefore, in 1403, the condemned doctrines of the realist Wyclif were defended by the realist rector, John Hus, the Germans flung themselves into the defense of Rome with all the ardour begotten of national hatred united with the *odium philosophicum*. The end of internationalism was seen when, in 1409, the Germans at Prague, to the number of five hundred [1] migrated in a body and founded the strictly Teutonic university of Leipzig. The old international life, the strength of which was due to the consciousness of unity and solidarity, when the students of Oxford and Paris, especially the more distinguished friars, journeyed freely from one to the other, had given place to the new national but divisive spirit so triumphant in the Reformation. Henceforth every separate state sought to establish its own universities, and by pains and penalties to forbid its students from journeying to foreign centres. But a triumphant spirit of nationalism in what should be the republic of letters leads inevitably, as alas! we have seen recently to our

[1] The numbers as a rule have been greatly exaggerated, and are usually given even by historians who should know better as 5,000. As a matter of fact, as Erler has shown by his publication of the Leipzig rolls, the total entrances at Leipzig were 507. Wyclif speaks of "once sixty thousand students" at Oxford. How absurd the figure may be gathered from the fact that the population of Oxford "town," over fourteen years of age, in 1379 was but 2,035. Probably even at Paris the students were never more than six thousand. By 1438 they had fallen off at Oxford to a thousand, a number still further reduced by the Reformation.

sorrow, to the warring conflict of nationalism in other spheres. Europe and America must revive in a new form the old university internationalism of the early Middle Ages, as the first step in the inauguration of a new age in which nations shall better understand and respect each other's different ideals.

We must bring these lectures to a close. We have touched merely the fringe of an inexhaustible and fascinating subject. In reality the secret of the mediæval Church must always remain unexpressed, since to-day it is incapable of expression. With all its defects—and the reverse side of the page may well fill us with amazement and indignation—the mediæval Church and the task she accomplished presents a noble spectacle of moral grandeur. Pages of her history are written in letters of living light, of more than golden glory. Where can we point to a sacrifice so deep, so abiding, so sacred as that of her sons? Who have climbed to higher peaks of spiritual experience? We may condemn the claims of her papacy as unjustifiable in origin, impossible, nay hurtful, in execution, yet cannot but admire the earnestness with which the great pontiffs believed themselves to be the ministers of a higher than human righteousness. We may despise the theology of her saints, but we cannot deny that they had learned the secret of the Cross. We may mourn over their superstition, but cannot refuse that they had an anointing from the Holy One. We may point out the depth of their errors, their limited vision, their rude methods, their warped ideals, but these things are but the rough externals which veil but do not

conceal the inward nobleness of their characters. That they without us should not be made perfect is not the condemnation of their hope, but the providential law of evolution. Considering, therefore, the issue of their life, let us imitate their faith :

Jesus Christ
The same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

Printed in the United States of America

JAMES L. GORDON, D.D.

All's Love Yet All's Law

12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

"Discloses the secret of Dr. Gordon's eloquence—fresh, and intimate presentations of truth which always keep close to reality. Dr. Gordon also seems to have the world's literature at his command. A few of the titles will give an idea of the scope of his preaching. 'The Law of Truth: The Science of Universal Relationships'; 'The Law of Inspiration: The Vitalizing Power of Truth'; 'The Law of Vibration'; 'The Law of Beauty: The Spiritualizing Power of Thought'; The Soul's Guarantee of Immortality."—*Christian Work.*

BISHOP FRANCIS J. McCONNELL *Cole Lectures*

Personal Christianity

Instruments and Ends in the Kingdom of God.

12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

The latest volume of the famous "Cole Lectures" delivered at Vanderbilt University. The subjects are: I. The Personal in Christianity. II. The Instrumental in Christianity. III. The Mastery of World-Views. IV. The Invigoration of Morality. V. The Control of Social Advance. VI. "Every Kindred, and People, and Tongue."

NEWELL DWIGHT HILLIS, D.D.

Lectures and Orations by Henry Ward Beecher

Collected by Newell Dwight Hillis. 12mo, net $1.20.

It is fitting that one who is noted for the grace, finish and eloquence of his own addresses should choose those of his predecessor which he deems worthy to be preserved in a bound volume as the most desirable, the most characteristic and the most dynamic utterances of America's greatest pulpit orator.

W. L. WATKINSON, D. D.

The Moral Paradoxes of St. Paul

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

"These sermons are marked, even to greater degree than is usual with their talented preacher, by clearness, force and illustrative aptness. He penetrates unerringly to the heart of Paul's paradoxical settings forth of great truths, and illumines them with pointed comment and telling illustration. The sermons while thoroughly practical are garbed in striking and eloquent sentences, terse, nervous, attention-compelling."—*Christian World.*

LEN G. BROUGHTON, D.D.

The Prodigal and Others

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

"The discourses are vital, bright, interesting and helpful. It makes a preacher feel like preaching once more on this exhaustless parable, and will prove helpful to all young people —and older ones, too. Dr. Broughton does not hesitate to make his utterances striking and entertaining by the introduction of numerous appropriate and homely stories and illustrations. He reaches the heart."—*Review and Expositor.*

HARRY F. WARD

A Year Book of the Church and Social Service in the United States

Prepared for The Commission on the Church and Social Service, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. 12mo, paper, net 30c.; cloth, net 50c.

ERNEST EUGENE ELLIOTT

The Problem of Lay Leadership

A Companion to "Making Good In The Local Church." 12mo, cloth, net 50c.

"What Christian ideal should guide our men's work?" "What methods may we safely use in realizing it?" "What must we do?" "What must we undo?" These are some of the problems pressing insistently on the minds and hearts of ministers and religious leaders of the present day. This timely book of Mr. Elliott's suggests some eminently workable methods of awakening the interest of men, some lines of study by which it, is hoped, they may advance materially in the knowledge of the Kingdom of God, together with some "pointers" for such as may aspire to leadership. The programs suggested are not theoretical. All have been tried, in whole or in part, in some local church with profit and success.

HARLAN L. FEEMAN *Prof. of Practical Theology Westminster Theological Seminary*

The Kingdom and the Farm

The Problem of the Country Church. Cloth, net 75c.

In compact form this timely book presents the problem of the country church and its attendant difficulty. Dr. Feeman was born on a farm, knows his subject well and writes with precision and authority. His suggestions have vision, breadth and sanity and offer a real scientific study of this vastly important subject.

D. C. TREMAINE

Church Efficiency

A Study of Methods. 16mo, cloth, net 50c.

A plan of procedure whereby methods of business efficiency may be applied to the work of the church. Mr. Tremaine is a layman and what he here presents is the result of special and careful study. Most of his suggestions have already been adopted and none are submitted untried. The conclusions are calculated to help lift the burdens of pastors, and in solving some of the problems of church life and activity.

CHARLES SILVESTER HORNE — *Yale Lectures on Preaching*

The Romance of Preaching

With an Introduction by Charles R. Brown, D.D., Dean of Yale Divinity School, and a Biographical Sketch by H. A. Bridgman, Editor of *The Congregationalist*. With Portrait. 12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

"From the days when Henry Ward Beecher gave the first series of lectures on the Lyman Beecher Foundation in Yale University . . . the task of inspiring young ministers to nobler effort in their high calling, has been well performed. But among all the lecturers few have ever so gripped the divinity students, the larger audience of pastors in active service, as did Silvester Horne. The intellectual distinction which marked his utterances, the fine literary form in which they were phrased, the moral passion which gave to their delivery that energy which belongs to words which are 'spirit and life,' together with the rare spiritual insight displayed all combined to make notable the service rendered by Mr. Horne to Yale University."—*Charles R. Brown, D.D., Dean of Yale Divinity School.*

The last message of a leader of men.

BISHOP THOMAS B. NEELY, — *Of the Methodist Episcopal Church*

The Minister in the Itinerant System

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

"Bishop Neely discusses frankly the fact that large numbers of strong men eagerly accept official service, leaving the intinerant pastorate. He states the system itself briefly, but the burden of the book is a full discussion of the bearing of it all on the minister himself. It was to be presumed of course that a Methodist bishop would conclude that 'the system should be maintained' and even that 'the appointing power should be untrammelled'; but it is none the less interesting to follow the argument. We do not know any other book which states the whole case with such eminent fairness."—*The Continent.*

EDMUND S. LORENZ, B. D.

Practical Church Music

A Discussion of Purpose, Methods and Plans. *New Popular Edition.* 12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

"Mr. Lorenz has had thirty years' active experience with both the theoretical and practical sides of church music in all its forms. This is one of the most practical books on the subject of church music we have ever read. Every page is suggestive and every suggestion is eminently practical. The book closes with a worthy appendix dealing with musical and hymnological books worth owning, choice church music for choir and solo use, and suggestive outlines and subjects for song sermons and song services."—*Advance.*

JAMES H. SNOWDEN, D.D.

The Psychology of Religion

8vo, cloth, net $1.50.

Psychology is one of the most rapidly advancing of modern sciences, and Dr. Snowden's book will find a ready welcome. While especially adapted for the use of ministers and teachers, it is not in any sense an ultra-academic work. This is evidenced by the fact that the material forming it has been delivered not only as a successful Summer School course, but in the form of popular lectures, open to the general public.

WILLIAM HALLOCK JOHNSON, Ph.D., D.D.

Professor of Greek and New Testament Literature in Lincoln University, Pa.

The Christian Faith under Modern Searchlight

The L. P. Stone Lectures, Princeton. Introduction by Francis L. Patton, D.D. Cloth, net $1.25.

The faith which is to survive must not only be a traditional but an intelligent faith which has its roots in reason and experience and its blossom and fruit in character and good works. To this end, the author examines the fundamentals of the Christian belief in the light of to-day and reaches the conclusion that every advance in knowledge establishes its sovereign claim to be from heaven and not from men.

ANDREW W. ARCHIBALD, D.D.

Author of "The Bible Verified," "The Trend of the Centuries," etc.

The Modern Man Facing the Old Problems

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

A thoughtful, ably-conducted study in which those problems of human life, experience and destiny, which, in one form or another, seem recurrent in every age, are examined from what may be called a Biblical viewpoint. That is to say, the author by its illuminating rays, endeavors to find elucidation and solution for the difficulties, which in more or less degree, perplex believer and unbeliever alike.

NOLAN RICE BEST *Editor of "The Continent"*

Applied Religion for Everyman

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

Nolan Rice Best has earned a well-deserved reputation in the religious press of America, as a writer of virile, trenchantly-phrased editorials. The selection here brought together represent his best efforts, and contains an experienced editor's suggestions for the ever-recurrent problems confronting Church members as a body, and as individual Christians. Mr. Best wields a facile pen, and a sudden gleam of beauty, a difficult thought set in a perfect phrase, or an old idea invested with new meaning and grace, meets one at every turn of the page."—*The Record Herald.*

LEWIS SPERRY CHAFER

The Kingdom in History and Prophecy

Introduction by C. I. Scofield. 12mo, cloth, net 75c.

"Anything that comes from the pen of this writer and Bible teacher may be accepted as thoroughly sound and intelligent in its presentation of truth. This is a study of the historical and prophetic aspects of the kingdom of God in their relations to the present age and that which is shortly to come."—*Christian Worker's Magazine.*

REV. D. M. CANRIGHT

The Complete Testimony

The Testimony of the Early Fathers, Proving the Universal Observance of Sunday in the First Centuries. 12mo, paper, net 20c.

The author of "Seventh Day Adventism" gives in concise, connected form the testimonies of all the early Christian Fathers from the Apostles down to A. D. 400. Invaluable to pastor and people—there is no other booklet like it.

C. F. WIMBERLY, B.A.

Behold the Morning!

The Imminent and Premillennial Coming of Jesus Christ. 12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

R A. Torrey says: "I am sure the book will interest a great many in the subject, who have not been interested in the ordinary discussions of the subject. The book is one of the three books that I would recommend to any one who wishes to take up a study of the subject."

HENRY T. SELL, D.D.

Bible Studies in Vital Questions

12mo, cloth, net 60c; paper, net 35c.

The new volume of Sell's Bible Studies is prepared for adult Bible and pastors' classes and for use in schools, colleges and private study. It deals, in a plain, concise and constructive way, with the vital questions of the Christian faith about the Bible, God, Man and the Church. I. Vital Questions About the Bible. II. Vital Questions About God. III. Vital Questions About Man. IV. Vital Questions About the Church.

EDWARD LEIGH PELL

Author of "Pell's Notes on the Sunday School Lesson"

Our Troublesome Religious Questions

12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

A frank, earnest inquiry into, and discussion of, the problems of religious creed and conduct which vex and perplex believer and unbeliever alike. The author displays a marked ability to take up these questions and examine them with sagacity, impartiality and an optimistic, triumphant faith.

PROF. HUGH BLACK

The New World

16mo, cloth, net $1.00.

"The old order changeth, bringing in the new." To a review of our changing world—religious, scientific, social—Hugh Black brings that interpretative skill and keen insight which distinguishes all his writings and thinking. Especially does he face the problem of the present day unsettlement and unrest in religious beliefs with sanity and courage, furnishing in this, as in other aspects of his enquiry, a new viewpoint and clarified outlook.

S. D. GORDON

Quiet Talks on John's Gospel

As Presented in the Gospel of John. Cloth, net 75c.

Mr. Gordon halts his reader here and there, at some precious text, some outstanding instance of God's tenderness, much as a traveller lingers for refreshment at a wayside spring, and bids us hearken as God's wooing note is heard pleading for consecrated service. An enheartening book, and a restful. A book of the winning Voice, of outstretched Hands.

ROBERT F. HORTON, D.D.

The Springs of Joy and Other Addresses

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

"Scholarly, reverent, penetrating, human. The product of a mature mind and of a genuine and sustained religious experience. The message of a thinker and a saint, which will be found to be very helpful."—*Christian Intelligencer.*

BISHOP WALTER R. LAMBUTH

Winning the World for Christ

A Study of Dynamics. Cole Lectures for 1915. 12mo, cloth, net $1.25.

This Lecture-Course is a spirited contribution to the dynamics of Missions. It presents a study of the sources of inspiration and power in the lives of missionaries, native and foreign, who with supreme abandon gave themselves utterly to the work to which they were called.

FREDERICK F. SHANNON, D.D.

The New Personality and Other Sermons

12mo, cloth, net $1.00.

Mr. Shannon, pastor of the Reformed Church on the Heights, Brooklyn, is possessed of lofty ideals, is purposeful, more than ordinarily eloquent and has the undoubted gifts of felicitous and epigrammatic expression. This new volume by the popular preacher is a contribution of distinct value to current sermonic literature.

William Carey Int'l University
3 1539 0070883